UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Work of Lord Brougham for Education in England

BY

AMY MARGARET GILBERT

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN HISTORY

FRANKLIN REPOSITORY
Printers and Publishers
Chambersburg, Pa.
1922

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Work of Lord Brougham for Education in England

BY

AMY MARGARET GILBERT

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN HISTORY

FRANKLIN REPOSITORY
Printers and Publishers
Chambersburg, Pa.
1922

Copyright
AMY MARGARET GILBERT
1922

PREFACE

It has been said that an age that has ceased to be irritated by the eccentricities of Lord Brougham is prepared to be interested in small details about him. The subject of this thesis gives opportunity for the presentation of such details in one of the many fields in which he was interested. The work does not profess to be a biography, nor does it deal with the theory and practice of education. Its object is to trace the educational work of this prominent man in the proper setting of personal history and the conditions of the time.

Lord Brougham's exertions in the cause of education merit recognition. He, above other statesmen of his time, appreciated the danger arising from popular ignorance. He succeeded in revealing the actual educational status of the country and attracted public attention to the subject.

Every branch and form of education felt his influence. His life, extending as it did from 1778 to 1868, not only coincided with the evolution of a national system of elementary instruction, but for many years presented the history of that evolution. He helped establish infant schools; he was the promoter of institutions for the elevation of the working man; he founded one university and was the patron of others; he advocated the repeal of the "Taxes on Knowledge"; and by means of a prolific pen he did all in his power to make education accessible to all classes. He propounded schemes for legislation, which, although failing of adoption, announced principles later to be embodied in the more successful plans of others. And when it became expedient to yield the responsibility of sponsoring measures he did not cease to follow with an active interest the course of events.

Due to the nature of the subject, government publications and the works of Lord Brougham have been the main sources.

Pamphlets and periodical literature, especially for the record of adult education, have been invaluable; while biography and memoirs have contributed interesting comments and criticisms.

I desire to express my obligation to Prof. Edward P. Cheyney, under whose direction this thesis was written, and to Prof. William E. Lingelbach for their encouragement and helpful criticisms and suggestions. I also acknowledge the aid of Mr. Asa D. Dickinson and others of the staff of the Library of the University of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Bunford Samuel and Miss E. V. Lamberton of the Ridgway Branch of the Library Company of Philadelphia.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Early Life and Intellectual Interests in Edinburgh..... 1
B. The British and Foreign School Society 5

CHAPTER II

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

A. Select Committee on Education, 1816 14
B. Select Committee on Education, 1817 19
C. Select Committee on Education, 1818, and the Bill for Charity Commission, 1818 20
D. Charitable Foundations Bill, 1819 35
E. Bill of 1820 39

CHAPTER III

THE INFANT SCHOOL 50

CHAPTER IV

ADULT EDUCATION

A. The Mechanics' Institute and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge 55
B. London University 73

CHAPTER V

EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

A. Grant of 1833 79
B. Taxes on Knowledge 86
C. Resolutions of 1835 89
D. Education Bills of 1837 & 1838 94
E. Committee of Privy Council on Education 101
F. Bill of 1839 105
G. The Social Science Association 111
H. Conclusion 114

BIBLIOGRAPHY 116

The Work of Lord Brougham for Education in England

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Early Life and Intellectual Interests in Edinburgh.

When, in 1805, at the age of twenty seven, Henry Brougham came to London, it was with full consciousness that he was beginning a new chapter of his life. This move, which to him was the first step toward a political career, was the result of a prolonged deliberation. To the urgings of his friends James Loch and Francis Horner a latent discontent had made him susceptible. The Scottish bar to which he had been called as an advocate in 1800, unattractive from the first, had become more odious each year. Edinburgh seemed to lack prospects for one who, at the age when a sublime success is the only goal contemplated, knew he would "rise near the top in the end".[1]

They were no mean talents, the direction of which was of so much concern to the owner. They had already gained a considerable reputation for him. From childhood he had won the appellation of a prodigy. His father, an Englishman, upon marriage to a Scottish lass had settled in Edinburgh. Here Henry grew up with all of the advantages of the parish school system of Scotland. This system he later extolled as cherishing higher objects than mere learning and inculcating a nobler ambition than the mere acquisition of prosody and the dead languages.[2] Moreover, through personal association with his great uncle, Dr. Adams, head-master of the high school, who was a sincere and warm lover of liberty, Brougham early be-

[1] Brougham and His Early Friends, II, p. 34.
[2] Autobiography of Brougham, III, p. 9.

gan to entertain feelings of abhorrence for every kind of oppression.

In school and outside he manifested an insatiable thirst for knowledge and a singular aptitude for acquiring it. At twelve he was reading Laplace's *Mecanique Celeste* in French and at fourteen he entered the University of Edinburgh. He delighted in the study of mathematics and science and at eighteen sent a paper to the Royal Society on "Experiments and Observations on . . . Light", which was read and printed in the Society's *Transactions*. After finishing the four year course of humanity and philosophy at the University in 1795 he began to read law. In 1797 he was admitted to the Speculative Society of Edinburgh, where with Francis Horner, Henry Petty, afterwards Marquis of Lansdowne, and others he distinguished himself in lively debates.[3]

From the first, happy over any opportunity to correct his master and display his erudition, these new evidences of distinction fostered an unbounded self-confidence. His life of close application to scholarly pursuits engendered a sense of independence which contemned the ordinary rules of life. He could work from morning to between two and three the next morning "as cheerfully as if it were all pleasure or exercise".[4] Recreation was indulged in with the same restless energy. In college days he was the ringleader of groups who went about twisting off door knockers and delighting in riotous sports.

But in spite of prominence, or perhaps for that very reason, Brougham was not happy. He felt the loneliness of conscious superiority and craved the companionship of a sympathetic understanding. In the letters to Loch we have glimpses into his soul which are rarely allowed later. He wrote, August 20, 1802, that Loch was the only person he could unbosom himself to[5] and again that he liked him better than anyone else,

[3] Dictionary National Biography.
[4] Brougham and His Early Friends, I, p. 364.
[5] Ibid., I, p. 364.

man, woman, or child.[6] The very composition of his nature, however, deprived him of the love and confidence for which he yearned. Cynical in attitude, fond of display, his pride subjected him to the ruling passion of dominance. A great discontent had made him its victim and law and the Parliament house were becoming more distasteful every day. "Nothing but absolute necessity can keep me at it", he wrote, "— I mean the total want of a substitute for it".[7] And so it was that in study he constantly sought relief.

> "Study—Labour of the mind—carried to such an excess as to become labour of the body also. This is the business of every man under forty; this is the sweetest of all works; this is the most light of all burthens; the most invaluable of all blessings. It is a good independent of all the ills of life, supremely and principally our own, subject to no fates, times, or seasons, pleasant in itself, and quickly and surely returning a plenteous harvest."[8]

He was deep in *The Colonial Policy* which he was writing and was constantly asking Loch to look up books for him and transact business with his publishers. Then, too, as if by the "chapter of accidents", in which he said he had not much confidence, it was in the summer of 1802 that preparations were being made for the launching of the *Edinburgh Review.* This work was to contain what former reviews rarely had, dissertations on the subject as well as accounts of and criticisms of the articles reviewed.[9] There was, at first, no organized staff of editors, Jeffrey, Sydney, Francis Horner, some professors of Edinburgh University, and Brougham being the contributors. With its refreshing audacity and intellectual opposition to established ideas this publication was a most appropriate outlet

[6] Ibid., I, p. 285.
[7] Ibid., I. p. 238.
[8] Ibid., II, p. 141.
[9] Autobiography of Brougham, I, p. 161.

for the restlessness of Brougham. To the first number he contributed three of the twenty nine articles and to the first four numbers twenty one, and four jointly with others.[10] On January 28, 1803 he wrote: "Though I am not one of the editors . . . . . they gave of their tens and twenties and I had literally to *write*, I may say the whole".[11] In the first twenty numbers he had as many as eighty articles. It was this review which, as the organ of the Whigs, was to be the champion of the education movement in England. The very first number contained an article by Horner on "Cristison's General Diffusion of Knowledge, One Great Cause of the Prosperity of Northern Britain". Brougham was to use it as his chief channel for publishing his views on the subject, and as his instrument against opposing forces.

And so it was that on November 7, 1802 he wrote to Loch that the Parliament house, his book and the *Review* "will work me hard this winter, but thank God I can bear anything".[12] From his literary pursuits and political inquiries he derived considerable satisfaction. His hope of ultimately turning himself to some great use was not extinguished and in the meantime he was contented not to "sink to the muddy bottom of Scots Law".

For what the change should be was a great question.

"The English Bar is in a very great degree tedious, and to say the least of it, somewhat uncertain. I look forward with no small horror to five years' dull, unvaried drudgery; which must be undergone to obtain the privilege of drudging still harder, among a set of disagreeable people of brutal manners and confined talents; any opening abroad seems a matter of extreme difficulty at present, at least to one who has no sort of interest. The army is indeed a resource, but it is the last, and only for incurables; besides, I have been too long of

[10] Ibid., I, p. 161.
[11] Brougham and His Early Friends, II, p. 32.
[12] Ibid., II, p. 364.

thinking of it. For the same reason the East Indies seems out of the question; and any civil appointment as secretaryships, etc., in the West Indies is, I suppose, as difficult to be procured as one in Europe. . . . . I leave you [Loch] to judge whether study, to which I constantly fly for occupation, can be of any great relief. It is, however, cheaper than dissipation, and is attended with some improvement which may enable one to profit by the chapter of accidents." [13]

But in 1803 he had sufficient will power to choose the first of these alternatives. He was entered at Lincoln's Inn and two years later took up his residence in London. Here he read English law and supported himself mainly by writing for the *Edinburgh Review,* his versatility and power of dispatch standing him in good stead.

B. The British and Foreign School Society.

Life in London offered a variety of interests to one who had an insatiable curiosity about all things. Primarily interested in his own advancement, it was with eagerness and zeal that he sought to participate in the questions of the time and any movement which was gaining prominence.

At the Borough Road, London, there was flourishing a new phenomenon in education, which had already excited the attention of the King and nobility and had aroused the Church of England from its indifference. A thousand pupils were being taught reading and writing and arithmetic under the leadership of one Joseph Lancaster, a poor, unpretentious Quaker. Older boys, first instructed in the details of the lesson by the master, drilled groups of pupils entrusted to them. The order and the cheerfulness of the school and the military precision of the teaching had from the beginning attracted public observation.[14]

London, at the beginning of the century, was caught in the

[13] Ibid., II. p. 344.
[14] Binns, p. 10.

grip of the Industrial Revolution. The factory system was drawing to the city great crowds of the working classes. This sudden growth of population involved the increase of child labor. Moral evils in child life arose and a generation was springing up with little knowledge on any subject save the automatic skill necessary within the limits of daily factory work. Before 1803 only one twenty first of the population of England had any opportunity for instruction;[15] in 1805 the State had actual charge of 200,000 children of paupers, for whose education no provision was made.[16]

Perhaps no country had as many ancient institutions for educational purposes as England; and yet, with proportionally the greatest means, the least was effected. Wealthy persons placed their children first under a tutor or in a private school, then sent them for secondary education to one of the great public schools and lastly to Oxford or Cambridge.[17] For the children of the middle classes boarding schools and day schools, opened on private speculation, were the common medium of instruction. Endowed grammar schools constituted a very insufficient supply for them and infant schools were entirely lacking.[18] Keeping school was considered a business venture, with pecuniary advantage the principal object, and the establishments flourished or went to ruin according to the qualifications of the master. The working classes fared worst. There was little possibility for their children to attend a grammar school. Although originally intended for rich and poor, the endowments had not obviated fees, which were now prohibitive to the poor. Their education was chiefly learning to read and write and was confined to the Sunday Schools, factory schools, schools of industry,

[15] Hansard, II, c. 49-89.
[16] Adams, p. 44.
[17] Hill, I, 202.
[18] Parliamentary Papers, Vol. 716.

charity schools (either endowed or unendowed), and dame schools.[19]

The Sunday School movement had been inaugurated in 1780 by Robert Raikes. As the number of day schools was much too small, and the children employed for six days in the fields and manufactories were unable to attend them, the idea of having schools on Sunday was conceived. For three or four hours weekly such schools were open, when young men and women belonging to different religious congregations volunteered their services to teach reading and occasionally writing and arithmetic.[20]

A few factories had schools connected with them before the clause in the Factory Act of 1802 attempted to make elementary education compulsory for apprentices. But this provision was almost an entire failure, for there is testimony to show that only six of the two thousand mill-owners made any change in consequence of the act.[21] Certain schools of industry existed in various parts of the country where children were made to be more or less self-supporting by some industrial occupation.

There were endowed charity schools, in which children of the poor were not only taught but sometimes provided with clothes. Besides, there was a class of unendowed charity schools, which had been established in the preceding century by the "Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge". In most of them education seems to have gone no further than instruction in reading the Bible, with knowledge of the Prayer Book and perhaps writing.[22] Apart from general inadequacy, abuses and misapplication of funds restricted their influence to narrow limits.

Children who were too young to work were sometimes

[19] Hill, I, p. 102.
[20] Raumer, p. 405.
[21] Hill, I, p. 102.
[22] Binnis, p. 4.

placed in charge of "dames" or of men physically and mentally unfit for efficient service, who in return for a few penny fees "kept school" in their kitchen, sitting-room or bedroom, amid the scenes of domestic occupations. The highest standard attained was the power of reading a little in the New Testament.[23]

But by far the most of the children were left to provide for themselves and roam the streets at will. It was not surprising, therefore, that when Joseph Lancaster began to gather together and teach the waifs of his neighborhood, his scheme met with encouragement by the community at large. For England at this time was not a hard-hearted and indifferent nation. This was an age of philanthropy, following upon one of religious revival.[24] Although the policy of *laissez-faire* in matters of education was strictly adhered to by the Government, a group of thoughtful men and women had a more humane social outlook. Elementary education was looked upon by them as a means of preventing crime. While it was thought unwise to elevate the lower orders above their station in life, there was a widespread opinion that every child should be taught to read the Scriptures, and the King in his interview with Lancaster in 1805 expressed the desire that every poor child should have this ability.[25]

Royal patronage had brought fame to Joseph Lancaster. Subscriptions to the institution had been begun early and in 1806 a published list showed a thousand contributors. But in that year the "Royal Free School", as it was then called, began to get into debt, for the enterprise had been greatly expanded.[26] As his youthful teachers had become more trustworthy Lancaster had found himself at leisure to accept invitations which had been pouring in to visit various localities

[23] P. P., Vol. 711.
[24] Lord John Russell, by Stuart Reid, p. 24.
[25] Binns, p. 13.
[26] Ibid., p. 13.

and explain his methods. In this way many new schools were established and placed under the care of men he had trained. But he was lavish in his expenditures and proved himself unsuited to the public responsibility which had been bestowed upon him. In January 1808, when his debts had reached £5000, two friends, Joseph Fox and William Corston, came to his aid, and together constituted "The Royal Lancastrian Association", of which the three were to be the managers. By July two other names, William Allen and Joseph Forster, were added to the committee; and before the end of 1810 these men deemed it necessary to greatly extend the membership.[27]

It was Henry Brougham, who as "an old friend" was consulted and at length on December 14, in Lancaster's absence, a meeting of influential supporters was held at the Thatched House Tavern in St. James' Street with Brougham in the chair.[28] A committee of forty-seven was appointed to raise the necessary funds. The Duke of Bedford and Lord Somerville were presidents and Brougham, Whitbread, Wilberforce, Samuel Romilly, Francis Horner, Thomas Clarkson and James Mill were among the members.[29]

By this time Brougham had become an eminent figure and his definite public support meant much to the movement. He was a frequent visitor at Holland House and had early been introduced into the political society of the time. His connection with the Whig press had assured his position with that party and in 1806 as a mark of favor he had been appointed secretary to Lords Rosslyn and St. Vincent on their mission to the court of Lisbon.[30] In November, 1808 he had been called to the bar and had joined the northern circuit, with no great enthusiasm for the profession, but, as his biographer Campbell states, he had sufficiently "legalised his mind" to deal with

[27] Ibid., p. 20.
[28] Hansard, 3 S., XXXIX, c. 448.
[29] Binns, p. 51.
[30] Dictionary of National Biography.

the cases that came before him. Then in 1810 he entered Parliament, having been given the seat for Camelford, which was entirely within the patronage of the Duke of Bedford.[31]

Lancaster was aware that his work was now in the hands of men of greater power than he; the group of friends had become a public society. As a strict line had to be drawn between his private and public work, he became exasperated and established a separate school at Tooting. But he soon had to appeal for more aid and it was then decided to separate the association entirely from his interference and management.

Meetings were held in 1813 in Kensington Palace and a constitution and by-laws were drawn up by Francis Place.[32] On May 21, 1814 the title was changed to "The British and Foreign School Society". Brougham moved the resolution for the formation of the society and explained the object it was to have in view.[33]

From the first it was the purpose of the committee to provide schools all over the country on an inclusive religious basis. They should be established, supported and managed by local people, but the society would guarantee their maintenance, assisting them from its own treasury whenever a temporary stringency in local funds might occur. The only restriction was that the schools were to give no denominational teaching. Church folk, Dissenters, Roman Catholics and Unitarians were all to be received.[34] Brougham had told Wil-

[31] Autobiography of Brougham, I, 339.

[32] Binns, p. 65.

[33] Hansard, 3 S., XXII, c. 543.

[34] Terms of admission to Union as given by the secretary to the Education Committee of the House of Commons:

"If any party or parties in any given town wish to establish a school in connection with the British and Foreign School Society and communicate to that effect, the committee generally will aid them by a grant of school materials, by training for them a teacher, and sometimes by a small donation; the only condition enjoined being, that they shall adopt the great leading principle of the society, viz.

liam Allen that he would "blow up the whole Lancastrian concern if he should find a tendency for converting it into an instrument of bigotry and superstition".[35]

The society had been sponsored for the most part by Whigs and Dissenters. In the face of this activity the Church became concerned and decided that its influence had to be combatted. To this end in 1811 "The National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church" was founded, taking over the educational work of the old "Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge". Children of all denominations were admitted, but all were obliged to receive instruction in the liturgy and catechism of the Established Church of England and were required to attend its prayers and services.[36] Churchmen were exhorted to support their own schools and an intense rivalry between the two societies ensued.

Although a Churchman, Brougham did not desert the first camp. He became one of the vice-presidents and continued to hold the position until his death. In 1820 differences of opinion were partially to estrange him from the society but the bonds of fellowship were never broken, and he even took the chair at the annual meeting in 1835.[37]

---

that the school shall be open on equal terms to all religious denominations, and that no catechisms or creed shall be introduced. Those are the only terms required." Hill, I, p. 59.

[35] Wallas, Life of Francis Place, p. 109.

[36] Form of application for admission to the Union as given by the secretary before the Education Committee of the House of Commons:

"In these schools the National system of teaching will be adopted as far as is practicable. The children will be instructed in the Liturgy and Catechism of the Established Church, and constantly attend divine service at their parish church, or other place of worship under the establishment, unless such reasons be assigned for their nonattendance as are satisfctory to the persons having the direction of the schools. No religious tracts will be used in the schools, but such as are contained in the catalogue of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Annual or other communications on their state and progress will be made, as required by the practice of the National Society." Hill, I, p. 59.

The rivalry of the societies was made more acute by the controversy over the origin of the monitorial system. The schools of the National Society were carried on in accordance with the ideas of Dr. Andrew Bell, and monitors were used. The two societies were soon involved in a hot dispute as to whether Lancaster or Bell was the author of this method. Much was written and the dispute did a great deal to make more prominent the whole venture in education. Brougham's own opinion was that if Dr. Bell was the inventor of the system it was, as far as he was concerned, a hidden invention, which had never shed a blessing on mankind and that Joseph Lancaster was the first person who taught schools in England in a practical way on that plan.[38]

The societies were for many years the chief means for the establishment of schools for the laboring classes. The bond which held the schools of each together was entirely dependent on their own discretion and the similarity of the principles which they adopted. On the other hand, it included neither dependence, superintendence, scientific direction, nor any form of regulations.[39]

From the first, Brougham's interest in the cause of education had been genuine. A person of scholarly habits, to whom the cultivation of his own mind had seemed "the most invaluable of all blessings", appreciated the value of learning. What impressed him was that the children of the poor were growing up, by hundreds and thousands, untaught, undisciplined and uncivilized, graduating almost inevitably in vice and crime.[40] The happy effects of the diffusion of knowledge he deemed to be, "to improve the habits of the people, to better their principles and to amend all that which we call their characters".[41]

[37] Binns, p. 102.
[38] Hansard, 3 S., XXII, c. 843.
[39] Raumer, p. 405.
[40] Binns, p. 287.

Up to this time, however, his furtherance of education had been but one of the many projects of a busy opportunist. But his association with the British and Foreign School Society had made him realize the inefficacy of all that was being done. Endowments, the societies, and individuals were all working with no relation between them, no independent test of their work, no control over them if they failed in the performance of their tasks. Brougham saw the challenge which the situation offered. In a letter to Wakefield, February 20, 1814, Place observed that he was "one of the few who saw the whole scope and extent of what it may lead to".[42]

It was a time when the education of the masses was put upon the defensive. Whitbread in 1807 had introduced a bill in Parliament to found a school in every parish with power to employ the local rates. Although passing the House of Commons, it was defeated in the House of Lords, for it met the prejudices of men who thought it expedient to keep the people in a state of ignorance, and who were alarmed lest false notions in politics and religion be spread throughout the country.[43]

The subject was an old one but Brougham was to be the first politician to make the cause his own. The popularization of knowledge was to be his own, sole, almost unaided act. While stimulating to popular patriotism, it was as a gift placed by fortune in the way of this young and ambitious man. For many years he was to be the motive force for the improvement of education in all its forms and branches. He set to work to give the subject thorough examination deprecating any rash entrance upon a wholesale plan of reform and preferring, on the score of practicability, a more gradual change.

[41] Brougham's Opinions on Education, ed. by J. O. Taylor, p. 12.
[42] Wallas, Life of Francis Place, p. 96.
[43] Romilly Memoirs, II, p. 207.

CHAPTER II

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

A. Select Committee on Education, 1816.

After being out of Parliament since September 1812, Brougham was given the seat for Winchelsea by Lord Darlington in July 1815.[1] Immediately upon his return, he began to set in motion some machinery for the furtherance of education of the poor in London.[2] He called the attention of the House to the fact that the individuals who had for some time associated with a view to promote education had discovered in the course of their inquiries scenes of ignorance, accompanied by misery and vice, that were shocking to contemplate. He estimated that of the population of 1,050,000 in London, according to the last census, no less than 200,000 children were destitute of the means of education. However meritorious the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society were, supported as they were solely by voluntary contributions and spontaneous zeal, they were not likely to accomplish much toward the removal of the ignorance which existed. His proposition was that a measure for the education of the poor under parliamentary sanction and with parliamentary aid should be tried in London; for without a previous experiment he would not deem it proper to bring forward any general measure. But if the experiment should be found to succeed, he would then recommend the extension of the plan to some other great towns, as Manchester and Salford. He also urged the propriety of establishing a school for the preparation of school masters, in order that benevolent individuals about to establish schools might know where to apply for duly qualified teachers. But throughout the arrangement for public education which he hoped to see estab-

[1] Autobiography of Brougham, II, p. 7.
[2] Hansard, XXXIV, c. 633.

lished, he trusted that nothing would be admitted offensive to any religious opinions, and that care would be taken that nothing be allowed to interfere with the just privileges of the national establishment. He would be willing to take a model from the plan of education established in Ireland with the support of the Government.

He, therefore, moved that a committee be appointed to inquire into the education of the lower orders of the metropolis, to report observations and minutes of evidence from time to time and to send for persons, papers and records.[3] There was no opposition and on May 21, 1816 a committee was appointed with Brougham as chairman and twenty five other members, among whom were Sir Samuel Romilly, Sir James Mackintosh, Mr. John Smith, Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Francis Horner, Mr. Lamb and Sir Francis Burdett.

Two days later an instruction was added that they should consider what might be done with respect to the children of paupers who were found begging in the streets in and near London or who were carried about by persons asking charity, and who had not been sent to any of the schools provided for the education of poor children.[4]

The committee was organized the day after the appointment and at once began to exert its powers with much activity. The following circular letter[5] was addressed to between eighty and ninety masters of the various charity schools in London.

"Committee on the Education of the Lower Orders,
June 4th, 1816.

Sir,

I Have to require that you will furnish me with Answers to the following Queries, with as little delay as possible:

1st. What is the nature of the School with which you are connected?

[3] Journal of H. of C., Vol. 71, p. 386.
[4] Ibid., Vol. 71, p. 386.
[5] P. P., Vol. 408, p. 313.

2nd. How many Children are educated there?
3rd. What are they taught?
4th. Is the new method of teaching [monitorial] adopted?
5th. Are they clothed and boarded?
6th. What is the Expense? distinguishing the Master's, Mistress's, and other Salaries.
7th. What are the Funds, and how do they arise? Specify the particulars of the last year's Income.
8th. What old Foundation Schools are there in your Parish; how are they endowed; how many do they teach; and what are their Expenses, distinguishing Salaries?
9th. Can you estimate the Number of poor Children in your Parish who are without the means of Education?
10th. Do the Parents of such Children show any reluctance to have them educated?

I have to require that you will address your Answer to me, at the Select Committe on the Education of the Lower Orders, House of Commons.

I am your obedient Servant,
H. BROUGHAM,
Chairman."

Answers to this letter were received and in addition heads of schools and other witnesses were brought before the committee. Brougham sat in the chair for three hours daily and personally conducted this inquiry.[6] Great labor was involved in sifting the evidence as to the number and condition of the schools destined for the lower orders. Also, "conceiving, though the commission under which they acted did not necessarily lead them to any inquiries concerning the management of the higher schools, yet that it authorized them to include these schools at their discretion; and conceiving likewise that some reports that had gone abroad concerning them required either to be confirmed or disapproved", they called before them the officers and heads of the Charterhouse, Christ's Hospital and Westminster and examined them accordingly.[7]

[6] Hansard, 3 S., XX, c. 170.
[7] Ibid., XXXIV, c. 1230.

In addition, no sooner was it widely known that some kind of education committee had been appointed in Parliament than communications from various parts of the country came in stating instances of abuse of charitable donations and other funds for the instruction of the poor.

On June 7, 1816 the committee made a first tentative report.[8] They had learned "that a very large number of poor children are wholly without the means of Instruction, although their parents appear to be generally very desirous of obtaining that advantage for them" and observed "the highly beneficial effects produced upon all those parts of the Population, which, assisted in whole or in part by various Charitable Institutions, have enjoyed the benefits of Education". Already, on account of the number of communications from the country at large, they were of the opinion that Parliament should as speedily as possible institute an inquiry into the management of charitable donations and other funds for the instruction of the poor of the whole country, and they thought that the most effectual, as well as least expensive, mode of conducting such an inquiry would be by means of a parliamentary commission.

Brougham reported that a committee above stairs was inadequate for the task, as it could not examine on oath, and as it would be impossible, or very expensive, to call up persons from all parts of the country to give evidence. The only remedy was, to appoint a commission with power to go from place to place, and examine witnesses on the spot. More money would be saved to the country than would be expended. The commission should be paid as the only means of ensuring its activity and bringing it under the control of the House. The business required dispatch, and dispatch or diligence could not be enforced upon gratuitous commissioners.[9]

[8] P. P. Vol. 408, p. iii.

[9] Hansard, XXIV, c. 1230.

On June 13[10] and June 19[11] Brougham presented further evidence and on June 20[12] made the fourth and final report before the close of the session. 120,000 children in London were found to be without means of education, and this deficiency was not confined to children of one description of people or another, but extended to all sects and all kinds of persons in the lower orders. Although the poor in general were anxious for education, in some cases parents preferred to let their children out to common beggars rather than send them to school. From 2,000 to 4,000 children were in this situation. In such cases, it was suggested that forcible interference between parent and child, whose morals the parent was corrupting, might be resorted to.

The number of charity and parish schools exceeded anything that could have been previously believed, and was highly creditable to the benevolence of the country. Even at a season of general distress, the funds derived from contributions for education had been found undiminished.[13]

Of the establishments created by public donations no instances of flagrant abuse were discovered in London. In the case of schools upon endowed foundations, however, the committee was forced often to acknowledge and lament that the expenditure of the funds had "neither been so pure nor so judicious as the intentions of the contributors were laudable and fervent. Instead of being employed in educating great numbers with the great sums raised, those who managed expended them in boarding, clothing and bringing up a few, leaving the rest totally without the means of education." For this Brougham feared no remedy could be expected from legislative interference, as the funds were managed by trustees who objected to any change and had interest in the contin-

[10] P. P., Vol., 408, p. 107.
[11] Ibid., Vol. 408, p. 165.
[12] Ibid., Vol. 408, p. 271.
[13] Hansard, XXXIV, c. 1230.

uance of the system. Discussion and investigation by a commission, however, would be a warning. He estimated that a sum of £18,000, distributed among a certain number of charitable establishments, which educated and clothed only 3,000 children, would under the new plan be sufficient to educate 30,000.

The committee surmised that the country at large would probably require no grants from Parliament for the purpose of advancing education, but it was their opinion that London would. Assistance, however, should not be communicated as an annual grant, but merely in aid of private charity, to build schools and to prepare rooms.

A great difficulty was the avoidance of religious differences. An emulation in well-doing, rather than a contention for superiority was hoped for.

B. Select Committee on Education, 1817.

Brougham had given notice[14] that early in the next session he would bring the matter of the report before the House. Pursuant to this notice, on May 22, 1817, he moved for the revival of the former committee.[15] He stated that a great deal of the evidence that was taken was necessarily *ex parte*, and was therefore susceptible of correction and revision; and it was desirable to afford an opportunity for obtaining that correction, on the part of the witnesses, by another investigation. The motion was agreed to and the same committee, with the omission of four members and the addition of one, was appointed. Testimony was made in the House of Commons[16] to the zeal, knowledge and indefatigable exertions manifested by Brougham in the production of the report which he submitted July 7, 1817.[17] On account of accidental circumstances not much progress had been made in the in-

[14] Ibid., XL, c. 1300.
[15] Ibid., XXXVI, c. 822.
[16] Ibid., XXXVI, c. 1303.
[17] P. P., Vol. 408, p. 325.

quiry before Parliament was dissolved, but the committee recommended that the subject should be taken up early in the next session, and they were of the opinion that it would be expedient to extend the instructions so as to embrace an inquiry into the education of the lower orders generally throughout England and Wales.

C. Select Committee on Education, 1818, and the Bill for Charity Commission, 1818.

On March 5, 1818, practically the same committee was revived with the more extensive powers of inquiring into the education of the lower orders in England and Wales,[18] and, on May 8, 1818, the instruction was extended to include Scotland.[19] In moving for the appointment of the committee, Brougham called attention to the annual grant given by Parliament to the Irish charter schools since the date of the union, seldom less than £40,000, and hoped that Parliament would see the propriety of bestowing some money for a similar purpose in England. But he trusted that whatever assistance Parliament might grant, would be given with great temperance and with the utmost precaution. To this the committee would probably first give attention, and next it would consider the expense that would be requisite in the first instance and what part of it might fall ultimately on the country. He was convinced that this ultimate sum would be very small, for there existed throughout the country large funds bequeathed by individuals for all purposes of charity, and particularly for the education of the poor. These funds had in many cases been grossly misapplied. There had been hardly a day in the two years since the matter first attracted public attention in which he had not received an account of some misapplication—of schools founded or meant to be founded, two hundred years ago perhaps, for which purposes lands yielding a considerable

[18] Hansard, XXXVII, c. 815.
[19] Journal of H. of C., Vol. 73, p. 330, May 8, 1818.

revenue were bequeathed, while in one place only a few children were taught, and in another none. But before adopting any measures for turning the funds for education to the best account it was absolutely necessary to have accurate information as to the circumstances of each endowment.[20] He, therefore, anticipated a recommendation to Parliament to adopt a plan of education for the poor throughout the country, and to appoint a parliamentary commission to investigate the misapplication of charitable funds destined for the education of the poor. He thought it desirable, also, that a similar measure should be adopted for inquiring into the general misapplication of all charitable foundations.[21]

The first report of the committee was made March 17, 1818, as follows:[22]

"Your committee are proceeding in the further consideration of the Subject referred to them; but in the meantime they recommend the bringing in a Bill for appointing Commissioners to inquire into the Abuses of Charities connected with the Education of the Poor, in England and Wales; that no unnecessary delay may take place in prosecuting this Investigation."

The necessity for such a measure had long been apparent. Abuses in the management of charitable endowments were glaring but they had not been properly denounced. Trustees had insufficient powers for profitable management or they were not able to turn the land to the best account. There were defects in the original constitution of the trusts, and a consequent extinction in many cases of the trustees, without the possibility of supplying their places. In many cases the funds were rendered absolutely useless by being withheld from the purposes for which they were designed, while in others they were almost equally useless from a too strict adher-

[20] Edinburgh Review, 30: 486.
[21] Hansard, XXXVII, c. 817.
[22] P. P., Vol. 408.

ence to the letter of the foundation. There was negligence in all its various branches and willful and corrupt abuse.[23]

The Court of Chancery was the only tribunal which had cognizance of breaches of trust and other matters connected with charities. A series of successive decisions of men of great eminence had established a system for purposes of doing justice in cases in which the machinery of the ordinary courts was inapplicable; but the Court of Chancery was useless for small charities. Mere entry in the court, the delivery of briefs to counsel, and the proceedings entirely absorbed or destroyed a charity of small amount long before the decree was finally reached. The idea of expending £700 or £800 on a charity which amounted to £10 a year was absurd.[24] In 1812 Sir Samuel Romilly's bill lessened the expense in some degree by having a more summary jurisdiction in cases where the lands had not got into the hands of third persons but remained with the trustees.[25] He provided that instead of proceeding by information in the cases to which the bill applied, the party might proceed by petition presented to the chancellor, and the chancellor might summarily decide the matter upon affidavit. But "summarily" could not be construed in the ordinary sense and the chief result seems to have been an increase of vexatious suits.[26] It required an extraordinary degree of public spirit and a determination to make great sacrifices of money and personal convenience for any person to become a relator in such a proceeding. It was not likely that many, with no hope of reward or even of indemnity, would enter on such a course for the sake of the poor. But the small charities were important and if properly managed would be in the aggregate a large sum.

[23] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 585.
[24] Ibid., 3 S., LXXX, c. 772.
[25] Romilly Memoirs, Vol. III, p. 350.
[26] Balfour, p. 155.

Brougham moved for leave to bring in a bill on the subject, and with Sir Samuel Romilly and Mr. Babington, he was ordered to prepare it.[27] As presented, April 8, it provided that Parliament appoint eight commissioners, to be divided into four boards of two each, who should receive salaries, and who should travel about from one place to another, empowered to examine witnesses on oath and call for papers, persons, records and deeds under penalty of commitment. They were to concern themselves with abuses in charities connected with education of the poor and the investigation of the education of the poor generally; and were to exempt the two universities, Westminster, Winchester and Charterhouse. To supplement the expensive individual complaints in the Court of Chancery, the commissioners were to have power to file a bill without cost. A semi-annual report was to be made to Parliament.[28]

It had been Brougham's original intention to propose that the inquiry extend to all charities whatever, but he had decided it would be advisable for the present to confine it to the charities for education, with an understanding that additional powers would be given the next session to include all charities. There would be ample employment for the commissioners for a considerable time in the metropolis and twenty or thirty miles around, and this would give time for finding out the sort of persons who could most efficaciously execute the provisions of the act. Another purpose would be gained by the delay—it would serve as a warning to those great bodies by whom charitable funds were abused.[29]

The bill excited no discussion in the House until it was considered in the committee of the whole. But, outside, the news of the bill had spread and those connected with charities be-

[27] Journal of H. of C., Vol. 73, p. 192, March 17, 1818.
[28] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 585.
[29] Ibid., XXXVII, c. 1297.

came alarmed. It was stated that the bill interfered with the management of charitable funds and that it intrenched on private property;[30] and that hardship would be involved in the production of deeds, as many institutions were under oath not to disclose them.[31] The use of force was denounced; a petition was prepared by magistrates and trustees of certain public charities of Abingdon in Berkshire complaining that they had been calumniated in statements made to the House;[32] and objection was made to the fact that some institutions were exempted.

Brougham, on April 27 when the bill was in committee of the whole, expressed regret that a previous discussion had not prevented these misrepresentations.[33] The bill, he said, did not interfere with the management but with the mismanagement of charitable funds. It was not encroaching on private property. "The fact was, that persons receiving money for charitable purposes were, as much as any officer of the government, entrusted with public property and had a right to account for it." As far as deeds were concerned it was only when the whole deed related to charity that it need be produced; when only a part was apposite, a certified excerpt would be accepted, and if the deed were in the hands of agents, trustees or mortgagees, due notice would be given. The use of force was essentially necessary. He defended the examination of the greater schools, for even these had part of their funds or endowments derived from donations granted with a view to educating those whose means were too contracted to admit the expenses of these seminaries or colleges. He felt the force of the remark concerning the exception of some, but refusal might endanger the bill in certain quarters; also, he pointed out, that these establishments were conspicuously in the eyes

[30] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 336.
[31] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 585.
[32] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 341.
[33] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 341.

of the public and might be examined by the ordinary proceedings in Chancery and by the inquiries of the House of Commons.[34]

The appointment of the commissioners by Parliament, he explained, did not proceed from jealousy of His Majesty's ministers but in consequence of precedents. He would not object to the appointment of commissioners by the ministry, provided the patronage would not be abused and there would be no ciphers.[35]

The bill was amended, at Brougham's suggestion, to include all charities and, as reported to the House of Lords, was entitled "An Act for appointing Commissioners to inquire of the Charities in England and Wales, and of the Education of the Poor".[36] It was late in the session when it reached the upper house and here it encountered the hostile opposition of the law authorities and a formidable body of prelates, and was only feebly and reluctantly supported by the ministers of the Crown. The second reading was called by a sort of political miracle and the bill reached the committee only by a majority of one.[37] Here it was so mutilated that Brougham scarcely recognized his own "offspring".[38] The recommendations of the bill were thought to be of a nature for which the country at that time was utterly unprepared. Lord Ellenborough denominated a plan "printed by order of the House of Commons and indicating a purpose of erecting a parliamentary trust of all schools in the kingdom, as a measure big with mischiefs of a most alarming magnitude".[39]

[34] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 585.

[35] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 336.

[36] Journal of H. of C., Vol. 73, p. 362.

[37] Brougham's Letter to Sir Samuel Romilly, Speeches, Vol. II, p. 65.

[38] A commission had been suggested after the defeat of Whitbred's bill in 1807, but Brougham said he was unaware of this when he proposed the measure. Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 585.

[39] Life and Correspondence of Viscount Sidmouth by Geo. Pellew, Vol. III, p. 220.

Two of the three objects of the bill were rejected—the investigation of the education of the poor generally, and the examination of abuses of all charities.[40] The number of the commissioners was changed to fourteen, six of whom were to be honorary and receive no salary. No member of either house of Parliament was to have salary, but traveling expenses were to be provided for all. The quorum was changed to three, so to form three boards one of the honorary members would have to be added. The commissioners were not to be named in the bill but were to be appointed by the Crown.[41] They could traverse the country and call witnesses but were to possess no power of enforcing attendance, or of demanding the production of any document. As it was objected that the possibility of committal might deter persons from acting as trustees, the commissioners were empowered neither to imprison nor to inflict a fine; only voluntary evidence could be called for. Moreover, they were not able to institute proceedings but were restricted to inquiry and report.[42]

The exemptions were greatly extended so as to include Oxford, Cambridge, and any college and hall within them; any school of which the said universities, colleges or halls were trustees; Winchester, Eton, Westminster, Charterhouse, Harrow, Rugby; all cathedral or collegiate churches in England; any college, free school or institution for the purpose of education for which special visitors were appointed by the founders; any funds for the education of Jews, Quakers, or Roman Catholics, and under the control of persons of such persuasions.[43]

These changes excited the ire of Brougham and called forth

[40] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 1242.
[41] Statutes at Large, 58 Geo. III, cap. XCI, Je. 10, 1818.
[42] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 1212.
[43] Statutes at Large, 58 Geo. III, cap. XCI, Je. 10, 1818.

his most impassioned invectives.[44] He denounced the bill as a powerless instrument, a mere mockery. The Lords had exempted the very charities where the most flagrant abuses existed—those with special visitors; for the visitors either lived at a distance, or they were patrons of the school and would not correct the abuses to which their system led; or they were heirs at law of the donor and would rather pocket the funds than apply them to their proper purposes. It would be a mere farce to call for voluntary evidence only. Although there were more commissioners they were so divided, with three as a quorum, that one less board would be functioning. It had been objected that the courts of law afforded ample means of correcting abuses. But as to expedition and cheapness and attention to the comfort of those who were involved in the business of these courts, they were qualities by which they were not distinguished. Some persons objected to the expense of having the commissioners inquire into small charities but it was just there that the necessity existed for they might show a larger amount in reality.

Since the bill had been so greatly amended the Select Committee on Education decided to reject it and proceed in the House of Commons by way of address.[45] On June 3, Brougham moved—

"That an humble Address be presented to his royal highness the Prince Regent, praying that his Royal Highness would be graciously pleased to issue a Commission to inquire into the State of Education of the Poor throughout England and Wales; and to report from time to time to his Royal Highness, and to this House thereupon".[46]

The motion was so framed that it called for the creation of a distinct commission in no way connected with that appoint-

[44] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 1212.
[45] Letter to Romilly, Speeches, Vol. II, p. 65.
[46] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 1226.

ed under the bill. It would have the effect of giving the House of Commons full legislative power by taking away the power of the House of Lords to negative a measure. For this the occasion was not considered serious enough and the motion was defeated.

But the bill, though mutilated, still contained some good. When Brougham considered the late period of the session he felt certain that unless he agreed to the amendments the whole measure would be lost. [47] Seeing a mode of working indirectly, he resolved to adopt it. Although only voluntary evidence could be called for, a report of those who refused to give information would be made; then if the House would reappoint the education committee the next year, it would be empowered to call these persons. As far as the exemption of charities with special visitors was concerned, the new committee could also follow up the report of the commissioners of all demurrers *in limine*. [48] He, therefore, called upon the House to take effective steps to render the labors of the commissioners effective by resolving to reappoint the committee in the next session, to constitute it of the same individuals and to clothe it with the same powers as at present. [49]

Brougham could not leave the subject without making one more effort to make the powers of the commissioners more extensive. He therefore moved—

"That an humble Address be presented to his royal highness the Prince Regent, that he would be graciously pleased to instruct any Commissioners who may be appointed under a bill entitled, 'An act for appointing Commissioners to inquire of the Charities in England and Wales, and of the Education of the Poor', to inquire into the Abuses of Charities not connected with Education".

[47] Ibid., 3 S., CLXIII, c. 695.
[48] Letter to Romilly, Speeches, Vol. II, p. 65.
[49] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 1225.

Upon the refusal of this he gave notice that early in the next session he would move for leave to bring in a bill to appoint, if possible, the same commissioners to inquire into all abuses of charities by which the property of the poor "had been dilapidated and plundered by those who met with the sanction of some, the fellow-feeling of others, and the protection of many—as was obvious from the vote of that night". This remark occasioned the accusation that he was slandering the House but it was insisted by Mr. Ward that Brougham had only pursued his usual course of "running riot against those by whom he had been opposed".[50]

In the course of the debate on the bill, when the possibility of having some honorary members of the commission without salary was being considered, Brougham stated in the House that no man could think more highly than he did of some of the gentlemen who he had heard would be named on the commission. As nothing but the labor could reward such an appointment, and no motive could engage anyone to accept it but a desire to see the matter conscientiously and steadily proceeded in, he publicly, without further ceremony, on the terms he had mentioned, begged to offer his own services as one of the commissioners. He had consulted his brother members of the committee, who had thought it fair that he should make this offer, from the part he had had in this business already, and from the interest which he took in the complete success of the measure. He offered only his time and his labor, and if he should have the good fortune to see this offer accepted, it would afford him the most heartfelt satisfaction. If incompatible with his seat in the House, he would resign that; for, as he believed from the bottom of his heart the inquiry to be one of the most important in which that House had ever been engaged, he did not know that he should think it too great a sacrifice to withdraw himself for a

[50] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 1226.

while from other duties, to afford that security which he knew his presence on the commission would give those who were anxious for the success of the inquiry, that the object in view might be unceasingly pursued to its accomplishment. [51]

As the selection of the functionaries was vested in the Crown it devolved upon Lord Sidmouth, by virtue of his office. Conspicuous for its absence was the name of Henry Brougham. No member of the Education Committee was put on the board to superintend the execution of their own measure and only two persons whom they had suggested were appointed. [52] Referring to the matter, Sidmouth commented,

"They are attacking me vehemently in the *Morning Chronicle,* but I am satisfied a selection was never made with more scrupulous caution or with more pure intentions." [53]

As a mode of bringing the whole matter before the public, Brougham, during vacation, employed his powerful pen on a letter to Sir Samuel Romilly. [54]

"My belief is", he wrote, "that great as the errors are which have been committed, some good may yet be atttained by directing the public attention to the proceedings under the Act; while, at all events, the defects of that measure, and of the steps already taken to execute it, can only be supplied by a full discussion of the whole subject."

And so he outlined the steps by which the committee had been prevented from pursuing their object in their own way and showed to whom the blame of the failure belonged.

The Select Committee on the Education of the Lower Orders had sat a week or two after the passage of the act for the commissioners. This had presented an opportunity which

[51] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 763.
[52] Letter to Romilly, Speeches, Vol. II, p. 82.
[53] Life and Correspondence of Viscount Sidmouth, Vol. III, p. 220.
[54] Speeches, Vol. II, p. 65.

Brougham had not failed to seize. While not particularly authorized to include the higher schools they might include them as a matter of discretion. So, as the universities, public schools and charities with special visitors were exempted from the jurisdiction of the commissioners, they occupied themselves with the examination of several of these institutions. The result was that abuse and errors of great magnitude were discovered in those which were excepted. They reported:

"That considerable unauthorized deviations have been made, in both Eton and Winchester, from the original plans of the founders; that those deviations have been dictated more by a regard to the interests of the Fellows than of the Scholars, who were the main objects of the foundations and of the founder's bounty; and that although in some respects they have proved beneficial upon the whole to the institutions, yet that they have been, by gradual encroachments in former times, carried too far". [55]

The committee in its final report stated that the discussion excited by the first report of the Committee of 1816 and the arguments urged in that committee to the various patrons of charities, who had been examined as witnesses, had had the effect of improving the administration of these institutions, and of inculcating the importance of bestowing their funds in educating a large number instead of giving both instruction and other assistance to a more confined number of children. "As the management of those excellent establishments is necessarily placed beyond the control of the Legislature it is only by the efforts of such candid discussions that improvements in them can be effected." [56] A vast mass of information had been incessantly poured into the committee. It seemed as if a

[55] P. P., Vol. 408, Third Report of Select Committee of 1818.
[56] Ibid.

new light had broken in on the country, for from places where no abuses were even suspected to exist, most important communications and disclosures had been received. [57]

The committee further reported [58] that since the appointment of the first committee for London in 1816, notwithstanding the severe pressure of the times, the exertions of charitable individuals and public bodies had increased, with the result that the means of instruction had been augmented in that quarter. Moreover, since the inquiries were extended to the whole island, the means of education for the poor were steadily increasing in all the considerable towns.

A circular letter had been addressed to all the clergy of England, Scotland and Wales and a digest of the information was begun. [59] The returns showed the greater deficiency in the means of educating the poor wherever the population was thin and scattered over the country districts. The efforts of individuals combined in societies were almost wholly confined to populous places. But there was evidence that the anxiety of the poor for education was daily increasing, and extended to all parts of the country, and was even prevalent in the smaller towns and country districts.

The committee had observed the liberality in many schools of the National Society where the catechism and attendance at church were only required of those whose parents belonged to the establishment. Roman Catholics were also anxious to avail themselves of these Protestant schools where no catechism was taught.

Brougham had voiced the opinions of the committee concerning suggestions for promoting universal education when he had addressed the House of Commons on May 8. [60] Two different plans were advisable, one adapted to the situation

[57] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 760.
[58] P. P., Vol. 408, Third Report of Select Committee of 1818.
[59] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 1207.
[60] Ibid., XXXVIII, c. 585.

of the people in cities and towns of considerable size (where the population exceeded 7,000 or 8,000), and the other to the circumstances of the people in small towns and villages and in districts wholly agricultural, where hardly a village existed. In the first, Brougham thought there existed, generally speaking, sufficiently ample means of instructing the poor.

"Not that there is almost any town where all can at present be taught; but that the laudable exertions of individuals are directed everywhere to this object and are daily making such progress as will in time leave nothing to be wished for. Societies are formed or forming of respectable and opulent persons who besides . . . . . furnishing the necessary funds, do not begrudge what many withhold who are liberal enough of pecuniary assistance—their time, their persevering and active personal exertions." . . . . . "There can be no doubt, that a sufficient number of schools to educate all the poor of such populous places may be maintained by the voluntary contributions of such bodies, if the obstacle is removed which the first expense of the undertakings, the providing school-houses, occasions. Where so powerful a disposition to carry on this good work exists in the community itself, we should be very careful how we interfere with it by any legislative provisions. The greatest danger is to be apprehended of drying up those sources of private charity, by an unguarded interposition of the public authority. The associations to which I refer act for the poor both as benefactors, as advocates, and as trustees. They contribute themselves; they appeal to the community through the usual channels of private solicitation, of public meetings and of the press; they raise sums by donations to begin the undertakings, and by annual subscriptions to meet the current expenses; they manage the expenditure, for the most part, with a degree of economy, which I am afraid can never be hoped for in the distribution of any portion of the state revenue."

Whatever the State should be disposed to do, he thought, should be confined to the removal of the cost of the school-houses. Whether the money should be vested in commissioners, empowered to make the fit terms with the private parties

desirous of establishing schools, or whether a certain sum should be intrusted to the two great institutions in London might be left to Parliament to determine.

"In the smallest towns and villages and country districts there is not found the same inclination to plant schools. . . . . Where individuals live in very narrow communities, still more where they are scattered in the country, they have not the habits of assembling in meetings, and acting in bodies. Their zeal is not raised by the sympathy and mutual reflexion which constant communication excites; and even when their dispositions are good, they know not how to set about forming or promoting a plan which must essentially depend on combined operations. In such districts we certainly cannot expect the great work of educating the poor to be undertaken by the voluntary zeal of the rich. And here, therefore, it is that I must look forward to legislative interference, as both safe and necessary."

The committee forbore to inquire minutely in what manner this system ought to be connected with the Church Establishment. Where means existed of erecting two schools, one for the Church and one for Dissenters, education would not be checked by an exclusive plan; but where only one school could be supported any regulations that excluded Dissenters deprived the poor of that body of all means of education. The committee were of the opinion that some connection ought to be formed with the Established Church for—

"It is dictated by a regard to the prosperity and stability of both systems. . . . . To place the choice of the schoolmaster in the parish vestry, subject to the approbation of the parson, and the visitation of the diocesan; but to provide that children of sectarians shall not be compelled to learn any catechism or attend any Church, other than those of their parents, seems to Your Committee the safest path by which the Legislature can hope to obtain the desirable objects of se-

curity to the Establishment on one hand and justice to the Dissenters on the other." [61]

D. Charitable Foundations Bill, 1819.

In 1819 Brougham was ready to carry out his threat of the preceding session to move for the reappointment of the Education Committee, but on the second night of the session a message was sent to him by Lord Castlereagh, Chancellor of the Exchequer, stating that he as a minister of the Crown was about to introduce a specific measure for augmenting the powers of the commissioners and extending their objects of inquiry. [62] The avowed intention of such notice was to make Brougham postpone his motion, for the committee would then be rendered unnecessary. Consequently, Castlereagh on May 21 moved for leave to bring in a bill "to amend the act of the last session appointing commissoners to inquire concerning charities in England for the education of the poor and to extend the powers thereof to other charities in England and Wales". [63] He had delayed until the first semi-annual report of the commissioners was in, from which he had learned that the inquiry had given no pain or vexation to any of the parties concerned.

The bill proposed that there should be twenty commissioners, ten paid and ten honorary, two of whom should be a quorum, except that a report to Parliament was to be drawn up by five. The salary was to be £1000 a year and £8000 was to be allowed for traveling and other expenses. The commissioners could examine on oaths and could apply to the Vice-Chancellor or the Master of the Rolls or the Court of the Exchequer to impose an unlimited fine upon all persons disobeying an order to answer questions or produce papers. In addition to the exemptions of the former measure, jurisdic-

[61] P. P., Vol. 408, Third Report of Select Committee of 1818.
[62] Hansard, XL, c. 1308.
[63] Ibid., XL, c. 660.

tion was excluded where the charities were created by voluntary subscriptions from time to time and where they were managed by committees of the subscribers."

The greater part of this measure Brougham approved. He rejoiced to see that all the old clauses which the Lords had rejected from his bill now came recommended by ministers. As to the powers, that of instituting process was a great improvement, although he thought it would be better for the commissioners to have the power of imposing a penalty and for the Courts of King's Bench or Exchequer to fix the amount. The exception of all charities principally supported by voluntary contributions he deemed necessary to encourage charity. But to the exception of charities with special visitors he was strongly opposed. There were 40,000 charities of all kinds in the kingdom and of these he estimated five in every 100, or in all 2000, had special visitors. Without supposing that there was any connivance on the part of the visitors, yet seeing there was a probability of abuses existing which had not come to their knowledge, there could be no objection, he thought, to the interference of the commissioners, who would inquire and not act, who would aid and not supersede the visitors. When no visitor was appointed the founder and his heirs were the visitors and the act of the last session had been interpreted to give power to inquire where the visitor and the trustee were one. Was it not inconsistent that where the founder had such unbounded confidence in a person that he appointed him not only visitor but trustee there should be inquiry, while where strangers were appointed there was none? At first he was sanguine that he could persuade the House to remove this exception, but if not, he hoped to have a clause adopted to put the visitatorial power in motion and to ascertain that it was in motion, and he would propose an amendment to allow commissioners to examine all cases in which the special visitors

" Ibid., XL, c. 1154.

desired it. He also would propose another clause to empower the commissioners to make orders in cases of gross and palpable malversation, without leaving the remedy to the delays of Chancery.[65]

But Brougham's motions to make these changes were not successful. He had been aware that misrepresentations of the conduct of his committees had gone abroad. Scandalous libels, questions that had never been asked and persons who had never been examined were reported.[66] He was now forced to defend himself in the House. His present speech was the occasion of a long diatribe from Peel, who was spokesman for the Tories.[67] Brougham's argument against the exemptions of charitable institutions was declared inconclusive. Why had Brougham not sponsored a measure earlier in the session? The committee of 1816 had exceeded its authority in inquiring into the universities and public schools. Peel said he did not call attention to this sooner because the report of the first committee was printed after the session and that of the second, in 1817, after the dissolution of Parliament. Brougham's committee had contained seventeen who were usually with him in politics and only three who were on the side of the Government and who would naturally uphold the universities. When the bill of 1818 was proposed the committee, rather than the Crown, wished to appoint the commissioners and any two were to have power of committal. Such power to a newly constituted authority and for a temporary purpose! Brougham's course in some of the examinations had been most discourteous. He had also published the statutes of Eton in the fourth report against the rules of the school after he had been told that the copy used, that in the British Museum, was imperfect; and on it he had made mar-

[65] Ibid., XL, c. 1296.
[66] Ibid., XL, c. 1308.
[67] Ibid., XL, c. 1300.

ginal annotations bearing the appearance of parliamentary authority. On July 10, 1818 one month after the dissolution of Parliament, he had sent a letter to a minister, referring to "inquiries now carrying on by the committee" and asking for a delayed report to be sent him, the chairman. In the letter to Sir Samuel Romilly Brougham had stated that in the Westmoreland election he had refused all applications for access to information of St. Bee's School. Could there be credit for forbearance in this when such an act would have been an abuse of power?

Brougham rose to defend himself, with his weapons of scorn and withering sarcasm.[68] Against this premeditated attack of Peel's he was suddenly called upon to defend his individual character and that of his colleagues, whose confidence he said he was proud to have enjoyed from the first day he had sat as their chairman, to the last when he had reported their proceedings; and this came at a time when almost the whole committee were absent. Peel had waited a long time before he had complained of the course of the examinations and the people examined. Before this he had been silent. "To be sure it might not then have been so easy to raise an outcry against the committee—because the foul misrepresentations of its conduct out of doors had not been disseminated, which made it now somewhat safe to join in the attack." But opposition until that evening was not a spark compared with this flame. Eleven of his committee had been ministerial members and many were capable of investigating the universities. "It was mighty well to complain of those attacks now as something sacrilegious, for the purpose of aiding in the House the insidious or ignorant clamours raised out of doors."

As for his discourtesy, he appealed to any member of his committee who might be present to state whether Peel or any

[68] Ibid., XL, c. 1308.

witness had a right to complain of his conduct in the chair. In the case of Eton no oath against publication of the statutes had been pleaded. "But no such oath is in law binding, or can stop the course of justice in the lowest tribunal in this country."

It was the uniform practice of every committee long after the end of each session to finish the reports and other papers of that session and have them printed and circulated. The letter which Peel had referred to he had carefully worded for he was well aware when that letter was sent, whatever he might have been before, "of the endless variety of malignant misconstruction and foul and wicked misrepresentation to which any man exposed himself who acted for the benefit of the poor", and who "with disinterested motives, and without fear of obloquy, exposed the hidden mysteries of abuse". The first letter had been sent when the bill was expected to pass with the clause requiring the commissioners to examine the state of education generally, as well as the abuse of charities, and aimed to get information respecting endowments. When the clause was struck out it was desirable to supply defects in the returns as far as regarded the unendowed schools, and the second letter had been sent.

It was also his privilege to lend his own notes, but he had abstained for he deemed it "perverting to party purposes" an inquiry that should be kept free from all such connection.

Peel's rejoinder to Brougham's speech, however, was that gentlemen who pushed themselves forward in that House into public situations, such as chairmen of committees, must expect to have their conduct very freely and fully examined. [69]

E. Bill of 1820.

Popular opinion had undergone a great change since the abortive attempt of Whitbread in 1807 for an act to found a

[69] Ibid., XL, c. 1308.
The commission was reappointed and existed until 1837. Brougham was chairman in 1836 and 1837. P. P., Vol. 391 & 392.

school in every parish. His opponents had objected that if plowmen and mechanics were taught to read they would thenceforward disdain to work. It was no longer objected that education would prove a detriment to the poor. In the House of Commons in 1818 Brougham testified:

"During this and the two last sessions, in all the discussions that have taken place, both in the House, in the committee and in the country, I have never heard a single whisper hostile to the universal diffusion of knowledge. Everything like opposition to the measure itself is anxiously disclaimed by all. The only question entertained is touching the best, that is the surest and most economical, method of carrying it into effect." [70]

On June 28, 1820 the Education Digest, which was prepared by the committee of 1818, was partially completed. [71] The committee had been working on it for a year but Brougham himself had been able to give only his summer and part of his vacation to it. The committee had begun by sending out a circular to the whole of the clergy of England and Wales, and Brougham himself had afterwards sent private letters. The result was a digest which exhibited "the clearest and most prompt information on every part of the subject". Tables were prepared which showed the actual state of education in every county, parish, and even small hamlet, and the defects which existed in each. Two keys were printed, one to the numerical tables and the other referring more particularly to subjects.

Based upon this, Brougham was now ready to submit a measure to Parliament. He was aware that it was an unfortunate moment to bring forward a question proceeding upon such abstract principles as this one, because for some time Parliament had been occupied with a topic to which the most

[70] Hansard, XXXVIII, c. 585.
[71] Ibid., N. S., II, c. 49.

intense attention of the nation had been directed, namely the domestic troubles of King George. Queen Caroline had just arrived from the continent to plead her cause in person and had been met by the support of the Whigs and great popular enthusiasm. Brougham as her attorney-general was a conspicuous figure of the day.

But the education measure he said would be second to none in magnitude and importance.[72] He trusted that by the production of the plan he would put it in the power of the House to do a benefit to mankind which would exist and be widely felt long after the other question would have been determined and long after the differences which existed between the individuals who were more immediately connected with it, would have been forgotten.

The statistics showed that England was the worst educated country of Europe. Only one sixteenth of the whole population was placed in the way of receiving an education, as compared with one ninth in Scotland. There were about 12,000 parishes in England. Of these, 3,500 had no vestige of a school, 3,000 had some endowments and the rest relied on unendowed efforts. 200,000 of the population of England were unprovided for either in endowed, unendowed, dame or Sunday Schools, or by private tuition.

The education in the dame schools amounted to almost nothing, for the children were generally sent too young and were taken away just when they were competent to learn. Brougham was of the opinion, however, that these schools were quite useful on account of the regularity and discipline which they inculcated. The Sunday Schools he thought gave a very small modicum of education and above all they did not give opportunity for the formation of the useful habits that were gained through the discipline of schools under the eye of a master.

[72] Ibid., N. S., II, c. 49-89.

In speaking of the relation of education to crime and poverty he claimed for education salutary and permanent effects. Miracles were not to be expected. "Education enlightened the people—it did not immediately remove them from crime."

The plan which Broughman was about to propose was not struck out in heat but was well considered by him and the committee. Every part of it was warranted by the information laid before that body. It was, he thought, a rational, practicable and feasible measure. The deficiency in education could not be met by voluntary subscriptions alone, although the exertions of the British and Foreign Society and the National Society had proved most commendable.

There was ground for apprehension that voluntary contribution might prove occasional and temporary.[73] The various rates and taxes upon the people were not lessening and were becoming a real burden; distress was general throughout the country.[74] After a peace of five years no considerable improvement had taken place in any branch of industry. And so it was that Brougham felt compelled to demand the aid of Parliament for establishing a system of elementary education for the people.

The plan presented was under four heads: I. Foundation of Schools; II. Appointment and Removal of Masters; III. Admission of Scholars and their Mode of Tuition; IV. Improvement of Old Education Endowments.[75]

I. Foundation of Schools.

The ecclesiastical division of the districts was adopted.

The initiative for proceeding could be taken by the grand jury at the Easter sessions; the rector, vicar, perpetual curate or

[73] Ibid., 3 S., XXVII, c. 1293.
[74] Edinburgh Review, 33: 155.
[75] Hansard, N. S., II, c. 49-89.

actual incumbent of each parish; two justices acting for a division in an ecclesiastical district; or five resident householders.

The tribunal which would then adjudicate on the subject was the quarter sessions. The cost of building the schools was to be provided by the treasurer of the county and was to be placed to the public account. Otherwise there might be an impediment to the establishment of schools, for the householders might be deterred from making application for a new school by the apprehension of being called upon at once for a considerable amount. Brougham advocated making them nothing but school-houses in the strictest sense—"buildings where the master and his wife, with a guardian to assist him, might reside, but in which no boarders should be admitted". All other expenses were to be levied as a school rate by the parish officers half-yearly. The salary of the master, for example, should fall on the country gentlemen. It was thought that only those parishes or districts that had not already voluntarily provided the means of education should bear that expense, and if the salary were locally controlled there would be a certain degree of control of the master's conduct as well. It was not to be less than £20 or more than £30. It might be objected that this was a great deal too little; but Brougham did not wish for sinecurists, or to take from teachers the desire of obtaining day pupils. He deemed it important that they should find their own interests immediately concerned in this particular. It was, in fact, important and it was his great object, that while measures were adopted for bringing education home to the doors of all, all should still pay a little for it. He was desirous of seeing the instructor live by his art, and obtain some remuneration from each of his pupils for his pains and the advantages which he communicated. He, however, allowed a power of increasing the salary with the concurrence of two thirds of the householders paying the school rate.

II. Appointment and Removal of Masters.

The master had to be between twenty-four and forty years of age, had to be a member of the Established Church and must have taken the sacrament one month before election. He had to present a certificate of character from a clergyman and three householders or from a clergyman and two householders of two parishes. Parish clerks were specially mentioned as being eligible.

The master was to be elected by the resident housekeepers, rated to the school rates, with the senior parish officer presiding and having the casting vote. The parson was to have a real and effectual veto.

A bishop or archdeacon or dean or chancellor was to have the power of visitation. Such visitor could remove a master, who would then have to appeal from the subordinate visitor to the ordinary and from the ordinary to the metropolitan. All of these would decide privately and not as courts. The visitor could also direct that a master after fifteen years of service should be superannuated with a pension not over two thirds of his salary. The parson was to be allowed at all times to enter the schools and examine the children. The diocesan was to make yearly returns of the names of the masters, the number of children, their care, the salaries and the average emoluments, and to make remarks thereupon.

III. Admission of Scholars and the Mode of Tuition.

(a) Admission of Scholars.

The parson with the parish officers as assessors was to fix the scale of the school pence. This was to be not less than 2d. and not more than 4d. a week. For children receiving parish relief the rate was to be 2s. per quarter or 2d. per week. If their parents could pay this sum, so much the better; if not, parish officers would defray the expense. Between those who were thus paid for and those whose parents defrayed the charge Brougham said he would allow no distinction to be

drawn. He would "never suffer the spirits of poor children to be beat down and broken by such a distinction", but would "always, on the contrary, store their minds, as much as possible, with the seeds of independence".

Parents were to be allowed to agree with masters for extra hours, or extra tuition, as they might think proper.

(b) Mode of Tuition.

The parson on each new appointment of a master was to fix a course of teaching. The three R's were to be taught in all of the schools to all of the children of fit age. In religion the Scriptures alone were to be taught, the parson having the privilege of fixing the passage to be rehearsed. There was to be no form of worship except The Lord's Prayer and other passages from the Scriptures, so that no sectary could refuse to send his children to one of these schools. The children were obliged to attend church once every Sunday with their parents or the master; Dissenters could take their children to their own churches or chapels. Every Sunday evening there was to be a school meeting for teaching the church catechism and other portions of the liturgy and all children were to attend except those of Dissenters who might object.

IV. Improvements of Old Education Endowments.

Trustees were to be enabled to apply to the Court of Chancery or any of the courts of equity for the correction of certain deficiencies in the powers granted them in their charters, and were to be enabled to improve the administration and application of the funds.

The trustees of the grammar schools were to contract with the masters to teach the three R's. This was to be voluntary with the present incumbents but binding on those next appointed. The trustees were also to make the number of children, now limited, unlimited and were to prohibit the taking of boarders. Where any charity establishments, originally designed for the purpose of boarding, lodging and clothing,

as well as for educating the poor children, were found deficient in funds, those establishments were to be confined to education alone. For Brougham made it clear that it was no part of his views, "to establish hospitals for the children of paupers, by making a provision to board, lodge and clothe them". Such institutions were in his judgment too much calculated to remove every salutary check to an over-abundant population and, therefore, ought to be deprecated.

Where the founder had designed that the children were to be taught in existing schools, the trustees were to treat with the ministers and the parish officers, or with two justices of the peace for having the children permanently taught in the parish schools. Or where funds were provided and no endowed school was in existence, the funds were to be applied in aid of the parish schools. In both these cases the names of the founders were to be placed on tablets on the outside and inside of the school house.

If all parties agreed that an endowed school should be put on the same footing with the parish school, no objection could be made to that arrangement and the master was then subject to the approval of the parson.

The first three sections of the plan were a modification of the parish school system of Scotland, established in 1698. There such a plan had been started, to have universal application, at a time when few schools were in existence. In England the situation was different; the ground was already occupied in great part by the two societies and groups who had voluntarily undertaken the task of educating the people. For this reason it was impossible to impose a system which would at once supersede those recognized and established institutions. According to the proposed bill the legislature was not requiring a school in every parish but it was providing a scheme whereby, at the initiative of the localities, deficiencies in the means of education could be met. When a school

would be decided upon, the schoolrate would become binding.

But an obligatory school rate was not the same as a compulsory system. The measure, as has been so often inferred, in no sense provided for compulsory education. There was no suggestion that parents, under the rigor of punishment, should be forced to send their children to school. The object was to make education so feasible that no one would refuse to send his children to one of the schools. All were invited rather than compelled.

The novel feature of the bill was the power which it placed in the hands of the Church of England. The memory of the strength of the prelates in 1818, in their opposition to the bill for the charity commission, was so recent that Brougham concluded he could secure the main objects of his bill only by large concessions to them. In presenting the bill he extolled the fine character of the well-educated and pious English Churchmen, who had manifested great zeal in the investigations of the education committees.[76] Religious education he felt was most essential and it would be assured if under the Church.

In taking such a course, Brougham alienated the support of the British and Foreign School Society, and was accused of deserting their principles.[77] The whole question of popular education became complicated by matters of religious controversy and jealousy. Brougham had expressed the desire that the measure should not be pressed too hastily, in order that advantages might result from discussion in and out of Parliament. For this he had not long to wait. Before the second reading the cry was made that the Church supported the bill and Roman Catholics and Dissenters rose in alarm.[78]

[76] Ibid., N. S., II, c. 73.
[77] Binns, p. 101.
[78] Hansard, N. S., II, c. 365.

It was supposed in consequence of the system's being connected with the Established Church, that it was intended to compel children of various denominations to attend Protestant worship. This feeling had operated so powerfully that some members of these two bodies had addressed queries to him on the subject. It was asked by one party if it were not true that it was intended to compel Roman Catholics to send their children to Protestant schools and Protestant worship; and certain Dissenters, seeming to consider this a bill introduced for the purpose of "rooting out the last remains of religious liberty in the country" had formed a "Committee for the Protection of Religious Liberty" to watch its progress. Brougham insisted that there was not a man in the House, or in the country, more averse to anything harsh or intolerant than he was. He was the last man to keep up tests unless they were absolutely necessary and much less would he assist in extending them. It was in vain that he reminded the Dissenters that he left the door of the school which he proposed to establish "not only ajar, but thrown right back on its hinges" for the admission of their children. They met, they combined, they reasoned. Brougham said they felt more than they reasoned, and they were more led by their passions, than by either their feelings or their reason. Behind his back "they candidly avowed their opinion, they amicably stated their reasons, they strenuously propounded their principles, they constantly urged their claims". Time after time Brougham met them in consultation, in debate, in public and in private, and during the whole time that these discussions were carried on, he made but one convert. "The Church wished for education; but they wished to keep down the sects a little more. The Dissenters wished for education; but they wished to pull down the Church a little more." [73]

[73] Ibid., 3 S., L., c. 592.

The bill was read the second time on July 12 and considered in the committee of the whole on July 13. The Church party itself only feebly supported it,[80] and such was the opposition of the Dissenters that when Brougham thought that he had come to a full understanding with them and that the measure might be carried, he was compelled to withdraw it "out of deference to their objections" and from his "sincere respect for them as fellow-laborers of many years in the cause of education".[81] It was ordered that the bill should be further considered on that day six months; which, as that date would fall beyond the adjournment of Parliament, was tantamount to a defeat.[82]

Section IV. dealing with Improvements in Old Education Endowments and to which so much objection could not be raised, had been made into a separate bill, but this, too, met the same fate, when on the following day its further consideration was postponed three months.[83]

[80] Ibid., 3 S., CXXXV, c. 550.
[81] Ibid., 3 S., CXXXIII, c. 1.
[82] Journal of H. of C., Vol. 75, p. 447.
[83] Ibid., Vol. 75, p. 452.

CHAPTER III

THE INFANT SCHOOL

While Brougham had been trying to secure a national system of elementary education he was personally interested in another phase of the subject, with which he deemed governmental interference extremely inexpedient.

In 1813 Robert Owen, a cotton manfacturer of Scotland, had formulated and brought to London his "New View of Society",[1] a plan for the regeneration of the world through the formation of human character. Convinced that existing social conditions were all wrong, he called upon the Government to stop the progress of distress among the working classes and proposed that a commission be appointed to examine the effects of his cooperative plan at New Lanark. He repeatedly pressed petitions upon Parliament and it was Henry Brougham whom he usually secured to present them.[2]

For Owen personally, Brougham had the highest respect and esteem. He thought him one of the most humane, simple-minded, amiable men on earth. He said he was indeed a rare character; for although a reformer he was one of the calmest and most candid men he had ever conversed with.

"You might discuss his theories in any terms you pleased—you might dispose of his arguments just as you thought proper; and he listened with the utmost mildness. His nature was perfectly free from any gall, he had none of the feverish or irritable feeling which too generally belonged to projectors."[3]

[1] "A New View of Society or Essays on the Principle of the Formation of Human Character and the Application of the Principle to Practice." Robert Owen. 1813.

[2] Cf. Owen's Autobiography Vol. I, p. 132; Hansard, XLI, c. 1198; Hansard, 3 S., LXXXVIII, c. 699; Hansard, 3 S., XCIX, c. 501; Hansard, 3 S., CXVIII, c. 124.

[3] Speech of Brougham, Hansard, XLI, c. 1195.

There was a strong resemblance in appearance between Brougham and Owen. In his Autobiography, Owen recounts with ill-concealed pride that on a journey from London to Scotland children followed his carriage under the impression that Brougham was within. Owen's Autobiography, Vol. I, p. 228.

Brougham conceived that the theory on which Owen's scheme was founded was wholly erroneous, but that certain parts of the plan were peculiarly entitled to consideration. "The system proposed and acted upon by Mr. Owen in training infant children, before they were susceptible of what was generally called education, was deserving of the utmost attention." [4]

Owen had been called to explain his system of schools before the Select Committee on Education in 1816. [5] In that year "The New Institution" had been opened at New Lanark, an important part of which was the "Infant School".

Independent of any work on the continent Owen had originated this form of school as a means of checking the evil effect of the factory system on children. He had come to the conclusion that the houses of the poor and working people were unfit for the training of the young, and that the infant school was necessary, based on the principle of forming character from the earliest period at which children could leave their parents. [6]

More than a hundred children from three to six years of age were brought together under two guardians, James Buchanan and May Young. No attempt was made to teach them reading or writing but much of their time was spent in a spacious playground where they were amused with games and stories. They were trained to habits of order and cleanliness, and were constantly superintended to prevent their acquiring bad habits and to form their dispositions to mutual kindness. These results were chiefly accomplished by example and practice, as precept was found to be of little use.

The fame of the institution had spread rapidly and thousands of visitors went to examine and criticize. Henry

[4] Hansard, XLI, c. 1195.
[5] P. P., Vol. 408, p. 240.
[6] Owen's Autobiography, Vol. I, p. 135.

Brougham went frequently and Owen says "enjoyed the goodness, happiness and intelligence of the children in these rational surroundings".[7]

Brougham was greatly impressed by the importance of this kind of school and repeatedly commented on its value. If a child were neglected till six years of age no subsequent education, he said, could recover it. If to that age it was brought up in dissipation and ignorance it was in vain to attempt to reclaim it by teaching it reading and writing. An infant was in a state of perpetual enjoyment from the intensity of curiosity. It learned everything sooner and better than at any other period of life and without any burden to itself or the teacher. But learning was not all, nor the principal consideration—moral habits were acquired in these schools; and by their means children were kept out of nurseries of obscenity, vulgarity, vice and blasphemy. Whether they learned less or more was of little consequence. The moral discipline was the great consideration. It brought the mind of the child into sufficient discipline by the age of six years, to give it all the advantages of the Lancastrian system afterwards.[8]

Brougham had, also, while on the continent, visited the establishment for infant education carried on since 1806 by Fellenberg at Hofwyl, Switzerland.[9] But this plan he deemed better suited to an agricultural district where the population was scattered, for the children remained at the school both night and day.

Owen's plan he considered better adapted to manufacturing districts and had the advantage of separating the children from their parents only during the day. It was calculated to improve the domestic habits of the people, "the child being allowed, by remaining with its father and mother, to acquire those social and domestic habits which were of so much value

[7] Ibid., Vol. I, p. 142.
[8] Hansard, N. S., II, c. 87.
[9] Ibid., XII, c. 1197.

in life, which begat strong ties of affection, some of the best and most secure bonds of mutual assistance". This system tended also by a sort of reflex operation to improve the habits of the parents themselves; for in the presence of children so trained "they would be ashamed of intoxication, or swearing or any habits that might pollute the minds or offend the feelings of those who were the objects of their attachment". [10]

With a view of making an experiment of this plan, Brougham and a small group of men, [11] who were also interested in the subject, met together in 1818 and subscribed £100 each to a stock purse for the establishment of a day school in Brewer's Green, Westminster, where children between three and five years of age should be admitted; and for the position of master they secured James Buchanan from Owen. The school was opened in November and for three mornings Brougham with the Marquis of Lansdowne personally received the children. [12]

On December 16, 1819, in the House of Commons, Brougham said that the institution was going on in the most satisfactory manner, so satisfactory indeed that although originating in the charity of individuals, it was soon likely to be supported by the interest of those who were immediately benefited by its existence. He expected it to compete with dame schools "which had heretofore proved so very useful and to which (while children of nine or ten years of age were too often allowed to walk about almost as ignorant as beasts) infants were sent, to keep them out of harm's way, while their mothers went to work". Parents would naturally rather pay quarter-pence to the infant school than to dame schools. [13]

[10] Ibid., XLI, c. 1195.

[11] Mr. John Smith; the Marquis of Lansdowne; Mr. James Mill; Mr. Fowell Buxton; Mr. Wilberforce; Mr. Wilson; Mr. Benjamin Smith; Mr. Henry Hase; Lord Ducie. Cf. Owen's Autobiography, Vol. I, p. 142; Hansard, 3 S., LXXXVIII, c. 274; Hansard, 3 S., CXVIII, c. 124.

[12] Hansard, 3 S., LXXXVIII, c. 699.

[13] Ibid., XLI, c. 1198.

He anticipated that the latter would get into better hands and be better conducted. If they were modeled after the school in Westminster and the schools of Fellenberg and Owen, he would not say that there would be neither pauper nor criminal in England, but he would say that Scotland or Switzerland would not have fewer than England even in seaport towns. The expense of the infant schools was quite trivial. They required but little money and a dame of good temper, who might let the children indulge in any amusement, always taking care, however, to keep them out of improper company.[14]

But he was convinced that the assistance of the government was not essential to the advancement of the movement, as the interests of that subject might be very safely intrusted to the private beneficence of the country.[15]

To Brougham's delight the scheme met with success. Wilson of the original group next founded a school in Spitalfields and for it obtained Wilderspin as the teacher.[16] Wilderspin was an enterprising exponent of the new idea and a voluminous writer who did much to popularize the movement. Other schools on a similar principle were established in various parts of the country and in 1836 "The Home and Colonial Infant School Society" was formed to provide training schools for infant school teachers.

[14] Ibid., N. S., II, c. 87.
[15] Ibid., XLI, c. 1195.
Brougham later changed his views concerning government asssistance to Infant Schools.
[16] Hansard, 3 S., LXXXVIII, c. 274.

CHAPTER IV

ADULT EDUCATION

A. The Mechanics' Institute and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.

The founding of elementary and infant schools was not the only sign of educational life in the first two decades of the century. That period had witnessed a number of important discoveries throwing light on the phenomena of nature and art, and the whole country was excited about the wonders of geology, electricity and chemistry. A thirst for knowledge seemed to have arisen. Everything indicated a growing spirit of inquiry, an increased desire for and with it a greater power of acquiring knowledge. The arts and the manufactures had made rapid strides and the application of the principles of science to their improvement was looked to with sanguine expectations. [1]

This prominence of science was responsible for a movement of the most important kind, which gave a clearly defined purpose and shape to wants that the progress of civilization had created. If the "Mechanics' Institute" had not been discovered in the way it was, the time had come when it must have been invented, for it had become a necessity of the age.

There has been controversy as to who started mechanics' institutes but the highest merit seems rather for first making them known and appreciated than for any actual discovery. To Dr. Birkbeck is undoubtedly due the honor of having originated the system of offering scientific instruction in an accessible form to the working classes. [2] As Professor of Natural Philosophy at the Andersonian University, Glasgow, he had his attention drawn to the difficulties in the way of intelligent artisans who were anxious to acquire information on scientific

[1] Tait's Edinburgh Magazine, 5: 521.
[2] Hole, p. 5.

matters and he, accordingly, in 1800, established courses of lectures to which working men were admitted at a low fee.[3]

The desirability of imparting scientific knowledge to working people was felt by others as well, and between 1800 and 1823 the propriety of attempting this and the mode in which it might be accomplished were discussed in several publications.[4] Some efforts were actually made to realize the object. In 1817 an institution entitled the Mechanics' Institute was established in London[5] and in 1821 the Edinburgh Society of Arts was started.[6] In 1823 the mechanics' class at the Andersonian University became the Glasgow Mechanics' Institution.[7] But neither Dr. Birkbeck's labors in Glasgow nor any of these institutions awakened public attention to the subject.

It was in 1823 that the movement received its first real impetus. In an article in the *Mechanics' Magazine* of October 11, 1823,[8] the editors proposed an institution in London similar to that at Glasgow. The proposition met with encouragement from the master mechanics, the workmen, and the friends of knowledge and improvement. Dr. Birkbeck assumed the lead in the movement and on November 15, 1823 a public meeting was held, a subscription was commenced and rules for the institute prepared.[9] A letter was read from Brougham in which he expressed regret at his inability to attend, but commended highly the objects of the institution and enclosed a liberal donation toward its establishment.[10] In January the institute was opened with between

[3] Dictionary of National Biography, article on Dr. Birkbeck, Vol. V. p. 80.
[4] British Quarterly Review, 26: 323.
[5] Hole, p. 5.
[6] Edinburgh Review, 41: 109.
[7] Dict. Nat. Biog., article on Dr. Birkbeck, Vol. V., p. 80.
[8] Mechanics' Magazine, 1: 99.
[9] Ibid., 1: 177.
[10] Ibid., 1: 178.

twelve and thirteen hundred workmen enrolled, each paying 1£. Lectures on Mechanics and Chemistry were begun and soon Geometry, Hydrostatics, Astronomy and the Application of Chemistry to the Arts and Manufactures were added. At the meetings Brougham was almost always present, "encouraging by his deep attention to the lectures the attention of others".[11] And in June he was publicly thanked for his exertions in behalf of the institute.[12]

Temporary accommodations had been provided in the chapel in Monkwell Street; but as it was soon desirable to place the establishment upon a permanent footing, a site was secured at the Southampton Buildings, Chancery-lane. Here it was proposed to erect a theater for the accommodation of a thousand students, and commodious apartments for a library, apparatus, reading rooms and offices.[13] At the banquet upon the occasion of laying the cornerstone on December 11, 1824, Brougham, after proposing the health of Dr. Birkbeck, made an urgent appeal for apparatus and books.[14] The building was completed on July 8, 1825 and was opened by Dr. Birkbeck "supported by his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, the Marquis of Lansdowne, Sir R. Wilson, Messrs. Brougham, Wood, Hume, Martin and other zealous friends of popular education".[15]

It was the work of the patrons to help in the establishment in the first instance but the whole body of contributors were on the same footing of members and proprietors. The management was entrusted to committees of which two thirds at least were working mechanics, and the funds were raised by the subscriptions of the working classes in order to secure

[11] Ibid., 2: 125.
[12] Ibid., 2: 221.
[13] Edin. Rev., 41: 115.
[14] Mechanics' Mag., 3: 189.
[15] Edin. Rev., 42: 502.

the permanence of the institution and to avoid the feeling of dependence.[16]

As in the case of the other branches of education, Brougham was not the founder or originator of the movement. He, as a friend of popular education, was an active promoter of a plan, which he highly approved. But the London Mechanics' Institute, like the other institutions which preceded it, was an isolated effort. It remained for Brougham to realize the possibilities presented, to popularize the movement and make "the sacred thirst for science epidemic". By an article in the October, 1824, issue of the *Edinburgh Review* [17] he brought the subject prominently before the public for the first time. In January, 1825, this article was embodied in a pamphlet entitled "Practical Observations on the Education of the People", and before the end of the year the pamphlet had reached its twentieth edition.[18] Upon the principles outlined in this dissertation mechanics' institutes were to be founded throughout the kingdom.

Brougham first justified his attention to adult education.[19] The "Practical Observations" was a portion of a larger discourse which he had been prevented from finishing upon the subject of popular education in its three branches, infant schools, elementary schools for reading and writing, and adult schools. He had endeavored to establish infant schools, he had repeatedly brought the subject of elementary education before Parliament, and so it seemed to follow that he should lend his powers toward fixing public attention upon the education of adults, by discussing the best means of aiding the people in using the knowledge gained at schools for their moral and intellectual improvement. The planting of schools for the young and the assisting of those more advanced in their studies were enterprises which might

[16] Ibid., 42: 499.
[17] Ibid., 41: 96.
[18] Brougham's Words, ed. by A. & C. Black, 11 vols., Bibliographical List, No. 4.
[19] Speeches, Vol. III. p. 99—"Practical Observations".

well go on together and prove mutually helpful. There was no reason to wait until elementary education had been completed. It was "as if a whole village would wait for breakfast until everyone got up in the morning". On the contrary, the deficiency in the proportion of schools to the population of the country would in all probability be much diminished if useful knowledge were diffused among all those who had already learned to read. The greater use they made of this acquirement, the more widely would the desire of having it be spread.

"A father of a family who can barely read, and has turned this talent to little account in improving his mind, may leave his children uneducated unless the means of instruction are afforded him by the state or by some other charity; but one who has made some progress in science, or in acquiring general information will rather sacrifice any personal comfort than suffer his children to be uneducated."

It was far, therefore, from being true, that they should wait till schools were provided for all and till all could read before they should consider how those who could read might best turn that faculty to account.

But a fundamental principle merited attention in discussing the subject. The assistance of the Government might be not only safe but advantageous and even necessary in providing the means of elementary education for children; any meddling with infant education would be inexpedient; but no such interference could be tolerated, to the smallest extent, with the subsequent instruction of the people. If a child be only taught to read and write, it was immaterial by whom and on what terms, but once suffer the least interference with the use to be made of these tools and the Government had made a step towards absolute power. Such a jealousy as he sought to inculcate he thought the more essentially necessary in a country—

"Where the existence of an Established Church, with its appendages of universities and public schools, has already thrown religious instruction into the hands of a particular class, and given the government great influence over the education, generally of the upper classes. In such a community, any interference with the diffusion of knowledge among the great body of the people would be pregnant with the most fatal consequences both to civil and religious liberty."

It was manifest, he stated, that the people themselves had to be the great agents in accomplishing the work of their own education. Unless they were thoroughly impressed with a sense of its usefulness and resolved to make some sacrifices for the acquisition of it, there could be no reasonable prospect of the grand object's being attained. And so he began by assuming that there was no class in the community so entirely occupied with labor as not to have an hour or two every other day, at least, to bestow upon the pleasure of improvement to be derived from reading—or so poor as not to have the means of contributing something toward purchasing this gratification, the enjoyment of which, besides the present amusement, was the surest way to raise their character and better their condition.

The difficulties which the people faced he classed under two heads—want of money and want of time. To the first belonged the impossibility of obtaining those books and instructors which persons in easy circumstances could command; and to the second the fact that the same books and instructors were not adapted to them, which sufficed to teach persons with leisure to go through the whole course of any given branch of science.

The first method, then, that suggested itself for promoting knowledge among the poor was the encouragement of cheap publications. In no country was this more needed than in Great Britain, where with all the expertness in manufacturing,

books had never been printed at so little as double the price required on the continent. The high price of labor, the direct tax on paper, the determination to print upon paper of a certain price, and the aversion to crowd the page were the causes of the difference, but, it was suggested, all of these except the first could be obviated. The duty on paper was an excise which had been levied since the reign of Queen Anne and at this time was 3d. on the pound. The tax increased the price of an octavo volume about nine pence. If a book were brought as low as possible to accommodate the poor man, with the coarsest paper and most ordinary type, it had to pay as much tax as the finest hot-pressed work of the same size. This tax, it was felt, should, by all means, be given up. But, though no part of it could be saved by using coarse paper, much could be saved by crowding the letter press and by having a very narrow margin.

The method of publishing in numbers was admirably suited to the circumstances of the poor. Two pence could easily be saved in a week by almost any laborer and by a mechanic six pence in a week might without difficulty be laid by.

Although the provision of cheap publications furnished the most effectual means of bringing knowledge within the reach of a poor man's income, other modes of rendering a similar assistance were circulating libraries and book clubs.

In addition, societies for the promotion of conversation were a most useful adjunct to any private education received by the working classes. It was suggested that master workmen assist by giving an hour off on the days when the meetings were held, and by providing a place for the meeting.

But the institution of lectures was of all helps that could be given the most valuable, where circumstances permitted, i. e. in towns of a considerable size. The branches best adapted to lectures were Mechanical Philosophy, Chemistry, Mathematics, Astronomy, Geology, and Moral and Political Philosophy.

"Much may thus be taught, even without any other instruction; but, combined with reading, and subservient to it, the effects of public lectures are great indeed, especially in the present deficiency of proper elementary works. The students are enabled to read with advantage; things are explained to them which no books sufficiently illustrate; access is afforded to teachers, who can remove the difficulties which occur perpetually in the reading of uneducated persons; a word may often suffice to get rid of some obstacle which would have impeded the unassisted student's progress for days; and then, whatever requires the performance of experiments to become intelligible, can only be learnt by the bulk of mankind at a lecture, inasmuch as the wealthiest alone can have such lessons in private and none but the most highly gifted can hope to master those branches of science without seeing the experiment illustrated."

For all of the lectures it was absolutely neccessary that the expenses should mainly be defrayed by those for whose benefit they were contrived.

"It is the province of the rich to lay the foundation, by making certain advances which are required in the first instance, and enabling the poor to come forward, both as learners and contributors. But no such scheme can either take a deep root, or spread over the country so as to produce the good for which it is calculated, unless its support is derived from those who are chiefly to reap the benefit."

The cost of lectures in large cities would be less than in smaller places.

"But it seems to us advisable, that, even where gratuitous assistance could be obtained, something like an adequate remuneration should be afforded, both to preserve the principle of independence among the working classes, and to secure the more accurate and regular discharge of the duty."

The most complete establishment would always be that in which a library was combined with the lecture; and it was ad-

visable that, in places where at first there was not money or spirit enough to begin with both, a library only should be established, to which the lecture might afterwards be added.

The men themselves ought to have the chief share in the management of these concerns. This was essential to the success, and also to the independence of the undertaking; nor was there the least reason to apprehend mismanagement.

After giving his "practical observations" Brougham concluded:

"The time, we rejoice to think, is past and gone, when bigots could persuade mankind that the lights of philosophy were to be extinguished as dangerous to religion; and when tyrants, or their minions, could proscribe the instructors of the people, as enemies to their power."

Following the circulation of Brougham's pamphlet mechanics' institutes spread rapidly throughout the country. From January to April, 1825 thirty new mechanics' institutes and libraries were formed.[20] In London, also, the example of the original establishment was followed; an institute was formed in the eastern part of the city and one was begun in Southwark. Among the remoter parts of the country, Northumberland stood conspicuous; by August 1825 not a single market town was without a mechanics' institute. Bath, Liverpool, Birmingham, Leeds soon joined the procession.[21] By November, eighty in all had been established. The London Institute had advanced rapidly after the completion of the theater and at this time 1887 men were actually subscribing.[22]

The diffusion of the system through the country was hardly a more natural or more immediate consequence of the original mechanics' institute than the adoption of a similar plan by cation from which the habits of a busy life were apt to exclude

[20] Edin. Rev., 42: 222.
[21] Ibid., 42: 501.
[22] Ibid., 43: 247.

the trading and professional part of the community. The association was modeled on the mechanics' institute but one night each week was set apart for discussion of historical, moral and political questions. [23]

The suggestion that had circulated from London had been effectual to another good purpose—the extension of similar associations to country laborers as well as artisans. Farmers' book clubs also were formed. [24]

Within the next few years all large towns and almost every village had its mechanics' institute, school of arts, association persons in a higher station and in easier circumstances. Early in 1825 men engaged in commercial pursuits formed an association for the purpose of obtaining those advantages of edufor popular lectures, literary and scientific institute or some institution in which lectures were delivered on various subjects, at hours and on terms which enabled the working classes to attend, and generally having a library to which those attending the lectures had free access. [25]

The curriculum in all of these associations was similar. Physical science presented the most complete and systematic body of knowledge possessed by man at that time and great results were anticipated from making the operatives acquainted with the principles of their trades. Accordingly when institutions were established for the education of the people, the experimental sciences occupied the chief place in the various courses of instruction and their application to the arts was held out as a leading inducement to attract the working classes. While Chemistry and Natural Philosophy were the staple commodities, other sciences were often given and now and then a course or a few lectures on Physiology and Political Economy were included. [26]

[23] Ibid., 47: 481.
[24] Ibid., 42: 501.
[25] Tait's Edin. Mag., 5: 521.
[26] Ibid., 5:521.

In the establishment of these institutions Brougham took a conspicuous and active part. He laid foundation stones and delivered the inaugural addresses on many occasions.[27] But he also set about at once to put into effect the recommendations set forth in the "Practical Observations".

He was aware of the difficulty of obtaining lecturers, and conceived the plan of preparing "Anonymous Lectures" which would be of a perfectly simple and intelligible description, containing the elements of science laid down in a way that would readily be comprehended by uneducated men.[28] It was necessary that the lectures be made plain enough so that they could be given to anyone who could merely read. His plan was that the first lecture should be read on one day, and at the next meeting of the class the same lecture should be read a second time together with half the second lecture, and then at the following meeting that half a second time with the latter half of the second lecture; so that every lecture would be read twice, giving the artisans time for discussion during the interval; and when their minds were whetted by such discussion it would be repeated and they would learn another bit. In 1825 Brougham devoted the summer to preparing a course of lectures, which were delivered for more than ten years in different parts of the kingdom.[29]

This system of anonymous lectures had the great advantage that several persons could join in preparing a course at a small trouble to each, every person contributing a lecture or two, if he could not write a whole course; and the lectures could be given simultaneously in many places.

It was evident, however, that with every assistance which could be given by means of lectures, the education of the people was chiefly to be accomplished by reading. The main reli-

[27] Companion to Newspaper 3: 356; & Quarterly Journal of Education, 10: 388.
[28] Speeches, Vol. III, p. 152.
[29] In 1835, also, he was preparing a course of twenty four lectures. Speeches, Vol. III, p. 152.

ance was ever to be on books. But elementary works that really met the requirements were rare indeed. Upon most branches of knowledge there was none which explained the subject to ignorant persons, persons whose habits had not been formed by previous study and who had not the help of experienced teachers at hand. This was a want felt not merely by the working classes, but by persons of every rank in society.

The ordinary reading of the people was but trashy. The circulating library and reading club could present merely literary novelties. It was easier in many country towns to get any new work, however worthless, than many of the classics of English literature. [30]

When Brougham recommended the preparation of cheap publications of value in the "Practical Observations" he announced the expected formation of an association for promoting their composition, publication and distribution. In April 1825, he asked Dr. Birkbeck, George Grote, William Tooke and others to constitute a committee for this purpose. Nothing was accomplished until November, 1826 [31] when they established the "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge". Any person could become a member by subscribing a pound a year to its funds, but the committee, of which Brougham was the chairman, was the governing body and conducted its affairs. [32]

In December it was advertised in the *Edinburgh Review* and other magazines that a series of elementary treatises would be commenced on February 1, 1827, under the title of

[30] London Magazine, 17: 559.

[31] Dictionary of National Biography, article on Lord Brougham by Rev. Wm. Hunt, Vol. VI, p. 449.

[32] Edin. Rev., 47: 127.

As the society flourished subcommittees were established in various towns according to rules published by the central committee. There were also correspondents in the United States and Paris. Edin. Rev., 47: 133.

"A Library of Useful Knowledge"; that each would unfold the principles of some branch of science, their proofs and illustrations, their applications to practical uses and to the explanation of facts or appearances; that in order to bring each subject within the limits of these treatises, the greater divisions of science would be subdivided into branches, and where any portion was of such practical importance as to require minute details, a separate treatise would be given upon it.

Under every head there would be references to the best works, or parts of works, where the subject was more fully treated, in order that the student might be enabled to pursue his inquiries further, if he should have acquired a taste for it.

The price of each treatise was not to exceed six pence. And, for this small sum, it was found possible to produce thirty two octavo pages, printed so as to equal above one hundred ordinary octavo pages. The treatises of the first eighteen months were to deal with Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Botany, Agriculture and History. Two were to be published every month and advantages in price were held out to distributors, as mechanics' institutes, reading societies, and education committees in the country. [33]

Brougham contributed the preliminary treatise on the "Objects, Pleasures and Advantages of Science". Most of the treatises, however, were produced on the plan of division of labor. The committee derived aid from men of science and letters in every part of the kingdom. Sometimes a few combined and cooperated where the departments were connected; sometimes more persons than one were engaged on a single work, one supplying the matter, the others arranging and writing it; and it was constantly the lot of different individuals to revise each other's compositions. [34]

The First Yearly Report of the committee stated that a cir-

[33] Edin. Rev., 45: 195.
[34] Ibid., 47:131.

culation of nearly 20,000 of each treatise had been established; and the preliminary treatise had reached its eighth edition.

But almost all of the first treatises were of an abstruse nature. At a meeting of the members in May, 1828, it was suggested that several of the scientific publications which had already appeared were not sufficiently adapted to the common class of readers, and it was also thought that many persons were repulsed in their desire for information by the forbidding aspect of even the most elementary didactic work that systematically handled the subject. To remedy these defects, to render the treatises accessible to every reader, and at the same time to entice those whose only wish was to amuse themselves, and to make them learn something worth knowing, arrangements were made for adding to the Library of Useful Knowledge certain popular introductions to such works as required them, and for publishing a second library, that of Entertaining Knowledge. It would be the object of the latter to comprise "as much entertaining matter as can be given along with useful knowledge, and as much knowledge as can be conveyed in an amusing form". The works were to be published in weekly numbers at the price of 6d. but the publication of no one was to be commenced until the whole eight numbers, forming a volume, were ready, so that those who could afford it might purchase the whole at once.[35]

Such subjects as "Menageries—Quadrupeds described and drawn from Living Subjects", "Vegetable Substances used in the Arts", "The Pursuit of Knowledge in Difficult Circumstances, including Anecdotes of Self-taught Men", "Insect Architecture" were treated.[36] But the society took pride in the fact that it never omitted a single occasion to give the useful reflections suggested by, or which could, by some stretch, be connected with, the more amusing parts of the treatises.

[35] Ibid., 48: 258.
[36] Ibid., 50: 181.

The society's success soon suggested the propriety of extending the sphere of its exertions still further. A series of maps was prepared at one third or one fourth the usual price and lithographed copies without the names of places, to be filled up as an exercise by the student, were published, at 3d. each.[37]

The want of a *Journal of Education* did not escape notice. It was begun with the object of giving a review of the books used in teaching, and recording and circulating all the improvements in the methods of acquiring knowledge made in the various parts of the world.[38]

The circulation of common almanacs in England was enormous. The nonsense which some of the most popular of these works contained, the ribaldry and indecency which disfigured others, attracted the committee's attention and with the object of gradually leading the taste of the persons who purchased them into better channels they started the *British Almanac.* This with a supplement, *The Companion to the Almanac,* formed an annual register of the successive changes and improvements in the legislation, industry, manners and education of the country.[39]

Another series of works was started to form a part, though a kind of extra part, of the Library of Useful Knowledge. The difficulty of inducing persons connected with country occupations, as yeomen, farmers, cottagers, farm-servants, to devote any portion of their time to instructive reading had been the worst obstacle experienced. Their habits of life prevented them from associating very much, and the disposition to rest and sleep after working in the open air, tended to disincline them from improving their minds by reading. But as they had sufficient time, more indeed than artisans, if the whole year were considered, it was desirable to provide them with

[37] Quarterly Journal of Education, 2: 194.
[38] Ibid., 2: 194.
[39] British Almanac & The Companion to the Almanac.

books. The Farmers' Series[40] was started to consist of treatises in a very plain and popular style, upon the subjects most interesting, because most useful, to those conversant with country affairs.

In 1831 Brougham contributed the first number of "The Working Man's Companion", or "The Results of Machinery, namely, Cheap Production and Increased Employment Exhibited"\; [41] and later his *Political Philosophy* was published by the society.

Two of the most popular of the ventures were the *Penny Magazine,* begun in 1832, and the *Penny Cyclopaedia,* begun in 1833. Their object was to distribute really useful knowledge in a popular and attractive form. The second proved to be a valuable addition to any library. Neither politics nor party discussion found access to the *Penny Magazine* and yet it was one of the most extensively circulated periodical works that issued from the press. The number sold weekly was 200,000.[42]

Although the mechanics' institutes and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge were gradually proving successful and extending their activities, the enemies of improvement had not ceased to criticize the instruction of the people and to ridicule the "penny sciences".

The *Quarterly Review* of October, 1825 commented that much of the alarm which these institutions had occasioned and of the opposition they had experienced, was to be attributed, undoubtedly, to the patronage and advocacy of Brougham.

"It is his singular infelicity to prejudice every cause which he undertakes to advance:—with all the zeal, industry, and pertinacity,—all the power of labour, endurance and priva-

[40] Edin. Rev., 49: 150 & 51: 526.
[41] Anti-Jacobin, I, No. 1.
[42] Preface to Penny Magazine, Vol. 1.

tion, mental and bodily,—all the self-confidence and versatility which Sallust attributes to his hero, and far more than all his talent, information and eloquence, he is yet confessedly the most unfit of all distinguished public men of the present age to lead a party, or to conduct the struggle for any great and opposed measure. His weapons are commiseration of besotted ignorance, sarcasm or interested motives, assumption of measureless superiority." [43]

He was warned not to inculcate an unwise and unfounded jealousy of the higher orders or labor to alienate those, on whom he would confer a great blessing, from their best friends and appointed guides; or to raise a spirit of which he could neither allay the fury nor delay the course and before which he would certainly fall an early victim.

Others pointed out Brougham's lack of knowledge of human nature.

"Taking men as they are, we cannot expect that an hour's leisure, caught with difficulty in a week of labour, will be thus employed . . . . . At all events the cause and the effect are alike melancholy and alike provoke a smile of sadness at the pleasing picture drawn by the 'Practical Observer'." [44]

It was scarcely possible to think that any prudent or sensible master would encourage or countenance meetings of his workmen, much less allow an hour off or begin early, or allow reading during work.

The times were marked by a fit of alarm. There was apprehension that the mass of the people would become too powerful for the Government. If to their physical superiority the moral force of knowledge were added, the multitude would bear down all before them and shake the whole order of society.

[43] Quarterly Review, 32: 410.
[44] Ibid., 32: 410.

The working classes were undergoing a change of feeling; they were distrusting the wealthy and aristocratic order and were entertaining absurd notions of equality "due to the dangerous influence of Mr. Henry Brougham and cheap literature". [45] Moreover, master workmen found it unpleasant that their workmen should be better instructed than they.

The church was aroused as well. [46] The accusation against Brougham of aiming to be "Dictator both to the Senate and the People by assuming the control of universal education" was revived. The knowledge of particular arts and sciences, it was thought, was not calculated to avail much toward the moral or social improvement of the people. Let them be taught Morals, History, Biography before they were introduced to Chemistry, Hydrostatics or Astronomy.

Mechanics' institutes continued to spread until about 1830. Then there was a visible decline in the number established. An examination of their composition showed that the bulk of the members did not consist of mechanics but of persons of a higher station of life. They were not operating solely or chiefly on the class for whose benefit they were designed. The non-existence among the poorer classes of an adequate appreciation of the instruction offered, in consequence of its over technical and scientific nature, and the misapprehension on the part of the founders of the real extent of the ignorance of the people were causes of this change. [47]

In an address to the members of the Manchester Mechanics' Institute in 1835 [48] Brougham could not help but express disappointment that few of the 1400 members were from the artisan class. He deplored their lack of appreciation of the advantages offered, for he was sanguine that if the working

[45] Fraser's, 2: 572.

[46] Reply to Mr. Brougham's "Practical Observations upon the Education of the People....." by E. W. Grinfield. London, 1825. Cf. Edin. Rev., 42: 206.

[47] Westminster Review, 41: 207.

[48] Speeches, Vol. III, p. 152.

classes were made more acquainted with the principles of their trades they would not only be better workmen and be more useful to their employers but they would have a chance of improving their position by rising in their profession. This education would make the people more orderly, better members of society and more disposed to be peaceable and obedient. Moreover, by knowledge and mental culture the people would be rendered happier in whatever condition they might be and would be prepared to appreciate the rights and better perform the duties of men and citizens. He would not exclude the middle classes, however; he was much pleased with their interest and he hoped that their presence would in the end provide a remedy for the first defect. For learning and improvement always made their way downwards in society. If the middle classes became aware of the pleasures of learning they would soon feel responsible for impregnating the lower classes with the same influence. Then he hoped that these very men, the artisans, would endeavor to become teachers and carry the benefits into the humblest class of the community which now sat "in the thickest darkness".

In the hands of the middle classes the mechanics' institute was destined in the course of time to be greatly modified; it was to be elevated from a mere technical school to a society designed to meet all the intellectual wants of the poorer parts of the population.[49] Lyceums, popular institutes, libraries with a more comprehensive purpose were to be established, but the fact that all of these found a place in English life was due in no small part to the active exertions of Brougham in the first decade of their history.

B. London University.

Another suggestion of the Practical Observer was vigor-

[49] Works of general literature and fiction were introduced into the libraries; and lectures on literature and miscellaneous subjects became more numerous than those on scientific subjects.

ously followed up. "London University rose like an exhalation at his bidding." [50]

Brougham had stated in his pamphlet of 1825 that the worst consequence that would result to the upper classes, if the bulk of the community were educated, would be that to deserve being called their superiors they, too, would be obliged to devote themselves to the pursuit "of solid and refined learning". "The present public seminaries must be enlarged and some of the greater cities of the kingdom, especially the metropolis, must not be left destitute."

Francis Place writing of the preceding decade said:

"Some years hence, when the exertions which have been made, and are still being made, to increase the desire of men in the middle ranks of life to have their children properly educated shall have succeeded, it will scarcely be believed how difficult, not to say impossible, it was for any man who could not afford to pay a very large sum of money to procure an adequate education for his children. I do not mean a merely classical education, i. e. the rudiments, or very little more than the rudiments, of French and Latin, and some of the elements of mathematics, which is all that nine in every ten of those who are classically educated obtain; but I mean besides these rudiments something more than the mere elements of mathematics, modern languages, political economy, politics, and morals, including the broad and comprehensive doctrine of motives.

"I have never yet been able to find any school, either in or out of the Metropolis, in which, at an expense within the amount which an ordinary tradesman is able to pay, he can have his sons taught as he wishes they should be taught, or even as persons in inferior stations in Scotland are taught, defective even as that education is." [51]

Higher education at Oxford and Cambridge extended little beyond the Church of England. At Oxford a Dissenter was

[50] Fraser's, 4: 93.
[51] Wallas, Life of Francis Place, p. 98.

not suffered to matriculate or enjoy instruction or any privilege of university, college or hall. At Cambridge he might become a student, but could obtain no degree, hold no office, receive no emolument and take no part in the government of the university or of any foundation.[52]

Moreover this education was confined to a few hundred families of the highest rank and greatest wealth, for it cost £250 or £300 a year[53] for each person at one of the universities. And as the seats of this limited education were at a day's journey from the metropolis, a residence there was required.

Immediately upon the appearance of the "Practical Observations" Thomas Campbell, the poet, and editor of the *Monthly Magazine,* addressed Brougham a letter upon the subject of founding a university in London.[54] With Joseph Hume, Isaac Lyon Goldsmid and some influential Dissenters these promoters held a meeting to draw up a plan, and form a union of all the different interests which were concerned with its success.

The object of the new institution was to give the advantage of a university education on moderate terms and near home, to those who were prevented from securing such benefit on account of the expense of Oxford and Cambridge or the indisposition of parents to let their children go from under their own superintendence.[55] Moreover, Brougham wished to give to the middle classes an opportunity of getting that education at a cheaper rate which their servants, their shoemakers, their farriers and their blacksmiths were now getting almost for nothing at the different institutions which had recently been erected for their benefit and instruction.

[52] Balfour, p. 238.
[53] Hansard, N. S., XVIII, c. 840.
[54] Edin. Rev., 42: 222.
[55] Hansard, N. S., XVIII, c. 1033.

With respect to the institution itself, it was not intended that degrees should be given, fellowships or scholarships conferred; it was not intended to apply to Parliament for any of those exclusive privileges of which the two universities were then in possession. But it was intended to secure the assistance of the best professors of the sciences, letters and arts in all their branches; and one great object was to lay the foundation of a good medical school.

Everyone was to be admitted without reference to religious opinion and, on account of their impracticability in this respect, Theology and the kindred studies of Ecclesiastical History and Biblical Criticism were not to be taught.[56]

The funds required were to be raised by shares of £100 each and subscriptions or donations of £50. Each share was to have the privilege of sending a pupil to the university and to receive also an interest not exceeding 4%. Each shareholder was to have a vote at all general meetings and in the election of the directors. Each contributor of £50 was to have all the privileges of a shareholder for life only and was to receive no interest. The students were to pay fees to the professors, five guineas yearly to the general fund and one guinea to the library.

The executive government was to be vested in a council of twenty one, composed of a chancellor, vice-chancellor and nineteen councillors; and the council was to choose and superintend all of the professors.[57]

In April, 1825, Brougham announced that he would make early application to Parliament for a charter, but the Government declined the granting of the request. A bill was then brought into the House of Commons in May for conferring the same privileges, i. e. making the new institution a corporate body.[58]

[56] Ibid., N. S., XVIII, c. 1033.
[57] Edin. Rev., 42: 346.
[58] Hansard, N. S., XVIII, c. 840.

The ministry, however, were resolved not to countenance it, and to save expense and delay the bill was dropped. Gross misapprehensions had gone forth on the subject. The principal objections urged against the plan were that no provision was made for religious instruction, that the metropolis was a dangerous neighborhood for youth, and that a joint stock company was ill adapted for superintending education.[59]

But incorporation was a privilege that was convenient but not necessary. On February 11, 1826 the deed of settlement was drawn up and in the course of the year seven acres constituting the site of University College were purchased.[60] The building was begun and soon became an object of attention in the neighborhood. At the laying of the foundation stone on April 30, 1827 it was announced that the institution would open in October, 1828; and when this did take place between seven and eight hundred students had matriculated.[61]

In the meantime a certain group of persons who entertained scruples against dissociating such an institution from the National Church advertised a new school, King's College. The fundamental principle was, it was stated,

"That every system of general education for the youth of a Christian community ought to comprise instruction in the Christian religion, as an indispensable part, without which the acquisition of other branches of knowledge will be conducive neither to the happiness of the individual nor to the welfare of the state".[62]

The admission of resident pupils and the teaching of religion appear to be the only novel features of the plan. King's College was founded and incorporated August 14, 1829 and was opened October 8, 1831.

[59] Edin. Rev., 48:235.
[60] Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th edition, article on London University by James Bass Mullinger.
[61] Edin. Rev., 48:235.
[62] Ibid., 48: 235.

The new phase of the movement was so far successful that in 1836 it was deemed expedient to dissociate the University of London from University College as a teaching body, and to limit its action simply to the institution of examinations and the conferring of degrees, the college itself receiving its first charter and being thenceforth designated as University College, London. The rival institution was also incorporated with the University and was thenceforth known as King's College, London.[63] Once more Brougham's initiative had called forth action on the part of the Church, and by rivalry a stimulus was given to the movement.

Earl Grey in writing to Brougham on October 7, 1828 said:[64]

"It must afford the truest satisfaction to everybody who thinks, as I do, of the public benefit likely to arise from such an institution. But to you it must be peculiarly gratifying, for you have been the creator of the establishment and your name will be forever united with the improvements which may spring not only from this, but from the rival college, which never would have existed but for the success of your exertions."

[63] Britannica article on London University.
[64] Brougham's Autobiography, Vol. II, p. 378.

CHAPTER V

EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

A. Grant of 1833.

The year 1830 marked a great change in the political career of Henry Brougham. The ten years following his brilliant defense of Queen Caroline had been a decade of immense activity. We are given a picture of his busy life at this time.

"He is in the Court of King's Beach all day in active discharge of the most laborious profession in the world, under which the stoutest nerves and firmest constitutions are found to fail, and afterwards in the House of Commons all night, a first-rate debater on every subject proposed; . . . . . he is in the Court of Exchequer often—in the House of Lords as often —before the Privy Council whenever it meets—a constant attendant at public meetings—in society frequently and yet finds time for the cultivation of literature and science, for general and most excursive reading and frequent composition." [1]

His own practice as a barrister had increased and he had become a potent force among the Whigs. On account of his popularity he was returned to Parliament for York in the general election of the summer of 1830. This he took as a great personal tribute. When in November the Whig triumph in the House of Commons was followed by the organization of a new Whig ministry he could not be overlooked, and after much deliberation he was given the great seal. He was then raised to the peerage under the ostentatious patent of Lord Brougham and Vaux.

In the House of Commons he had been a factor to be reckoned with and it was only with reluctance that he gave up his seat in that body. He had desired to enter the cabinet as Master of the Rolls so that he need not leave the lower house.

[1] Edinburgh Review, 42: 241.

Now in the House of Lords he had won personal prestige but his actual power was much lessened.[2]

In the House of Commons his place in the advocacy of education was taken by others, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Wise and Lord John Russell. They were ready to espouse the cause of which, fourteen years before, he was the sole conspicuous advocate. The spread of laborers' and mechanics' institutes, reading rooms, libraries, penny magazines, cheap encyclopaedias, educational societies and lectures on Natural Philosophy and Political Economy had helped to form a sound public opinion as to the necessity and duty of popular education.[3] Elementary instruction was beginning to be recognized by the poor man himself as something absolutely necessary in gaining his ends.

After the agitation for the Reform Bill had subsided, the people began to urge remedial legislation on all kinds of subjects. The adoption of a uniform system of education for the poorer classes of the realm was urged upon the House of Commons by petition. The Unitarian Christian Congregation of Greengate, Salford,[4] and the Inhabitants of Liverpool[5] in February 1833 prayed the House to adopt measures for promoting and improving the national education. The inhabitants of Epping and Harlow[6] were convinced "by long experience" that the desirable and necessary object of general education could not be obtained by the zeal and benevolence of societies and individuals alone, however laudably and actively exerted, and asked the House to consider a plan for the instruction of the poorer classes of society. In May a resolution of Lord Kerry was passed for an address to the King that he direct an investigation of the state of education in each town,

[2] Dictionary of National Biography, article on Lord Brougham.
[3] Hole, p. 11.
[4] Journal of H. of C., Vol. 88, p. 45.
[5] Ibid., Vol. 88, p. 57.
[6] Ibid., Vol. 88, p. 309.

parish, chapelry or extra parochial place, stating the amount of the population in each place and specifying—

"1. Whether the said Schools are Infant, Daily, or Sunday Schools;
2. whether they are confined, either nominally or virtually, to the use of Children of the Established Church, or of any other Religious Denomination;
3. whether they are endowed or unendowed;
4. by what Funds they are supported; if unendowed, whether by payments from the Scholars or otherwise;
5. the Numbers and Sexes of the Scholars in each School;
6. the Age at which the Children generally enter, and at which they generally quit School;
7. the Salaries and other Emoluments allowed to the Masters or Mistresses in each School; and shall also distinguish,
8. those Schools which have been established or revived since 1818; and,
9. those Schools to which a lending Library is attached."[7]

On July 30 Mr. Roebuck moved that the House acknowledge as a principle of government that the education of the people was a matter of national concern and that early in the next session, they proceed to devise a means for the universal and national education of the whole people.[8] He advocated compulsion to the extent of making it an offense to keep a child away from school between six and twelve years of age. Lord Althorp objected to binding the Government by the resolution but intimated that the Government was not passive. So the motion had to be withdrawn.

Meanwhile to the country at large it appeared that Brougham as Lord Chancellor, too much absorbed in his own advancement, had forsaken their cause. Hume in the House

[7] Ibid., Vol. 88, p. 435.
[8] Hansard, 3 S., XX, c. 170.

of Commons on April 25, 1833 said that he in common with the whole country felt deeply grieved that His Majesty's ministers had not brought before the House, as leading questions, the subjects of education and the poor laws. He was very sorry that the Lord Chancellor—all powerful as he was in the cabinet—had so grievously disappointed the ardent expectations of the whole nation on this most important subject, which he felt inevitably had to be brought under consideration, whether the present ministers liked it or not. [9]

But Brougham was not indifferent. The report of the committee of 1818 stood as something basic in its principles. It was only the means of applying those principles that had been defeated in 1820. Until he came into office in 1830 he had not the power of giving effect to this report. [10] What he had failed to accomplish by legislation he now set in motion through personal power. In the cabinet of Earl Grey there were several men who had taken more than a passing interest in the cause of education. Lord John Russell, the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Althorp, and Earl Grey himself had been old friends of the movement. And so, Brougham states, as soon as the agitation occasioned by the Reform Bill had subsided, "I deemed it my duty to call the attention of my colleagues to the Report of the Education Committee". [11] He laid the matter before Lords Grey and Althorp of the Treasury and obtained their concurrence for a plan of granting money, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of 1818. It had been stated that if the original cost of the undertaking, occasioned chiefly by the erection and purchase of the schoolhouse, were supplied, private subscriptions would meet the yearly expenses of the schools. Consequently the supply report of August 17, 1833 contained the following:

[9] Ibid., 3 S., XVII, c. 594.
[10] Ibid., 3 S., CXXIX, c. 973.
[11] Ibid., 3 S., CLV, c. 252.

"Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee, That a sum, not exceeding Twenty thousand pounds, be granted to His Majesty, to be issued in aid of Private Subscriptions for the erection of School Houses, for the Education of the Children of the Poorer Classes in Great Britain to the 31st day of March 1834; and that the said sum be issued and paid without any fee or other deduction whatsoever." [12]

The grant was voted by the House of Commons and the application of the sum was entrusted to the Treasury. This department adopted one of the modes of distribution suggested by the Committee of 1818, namely through the British and Foreign and the National Societies. Minutes of the Treasury, approved by Orders in Council, outlined the principles to be followed. [13] They were:

"1. The money was to be spent on new school-houses only, which were not to include dwellings for teachers or attendants.

2. At least half of the total cost for the building was to be raised by private subscriptions. This money was to be received, expended, and accounted for before the receipt of any public money.

3. All appeals for grants were to be sent through the National Schools Society or the British and Foreign Schools Society. These were to report to, and satisfy, the Treasury Board as to the need for a grant, and as to the reasonable expectation of the permanent support of the school to be built.

4. The managers of schools built by the aid of such grants were to be bound to submit their accounts to audit, and make periodical reports on the state of the school and the number of children educated therein.

5. In giving grants, preference would be shown to large towns and cities; and due inquiry would be made as to the charitable funds available for public education already existing, in judging of the needs of the place." [14]

[12] Journal of H. of C., Vol. 88, p. 692.
[13] Hansard, 3 S., XXVIII, c. 71.
[14] Holman, p. 60.

But a small grant of money was a far cry from a national system of education. The Scotch system was held up in contrast and many persons demanded of Brougham a reason for his hesitation in bringing in a bill. On April 16, 1834, in moving for a return of the charities in a list of counties, he took occasion to explain his attitude.[15] The parish school system of Scotland was not equally applicable to England. If Parliament required a school in every parish, voluntary contributions would end. In 1820 they were deprived, on account of the jealousy of the sects, of what was in his belief a most unexceptionably framed system of parochial education. Nevertheless, out of the evil had come good, for the animosity or rivalry of conflicting sects had given rise to new exertions for the furtherance of popular instruction. When in 1828 the Test and Corporation Acts had been removed he had thought it expedient to ascertain by private inquiries whether there had been an increase or decrease of education during those ten years. Accordingly, he had addressed a circular to the clergymen of seven hundred parishes, indiscriminately from town and country, requesting the necessary information. About five hundred replies were received showing that the number of unendowed schools in those parishes had doubled and the number of scholars had increased in the proportion of twenty one to ten. The number of children in endowed schools had fallen off from 166,000 to 150,000.[16] The friends of parish schools had in periodical publications charged him with exaggeration but the report of Lord Kerry's Commission which had been appointed the preceding year had shown by a comparative view in two districts, Bedford and Manchester, from 1818-1833, that his opinion was confirmed. Did not this show that it might be very imprudent to run the risk of doing away with the system of voluntary

[15] Hansard, 3 S., XXII, c. 843.
[16] Ibid., 3 S., XXVII, c. 1293.

contribution by imposing a school rate? A modified parish system was proposed in 1818 because it was feared that voluntary contributions might prove occasional and temporary, but now statistics removed such an apprehension. If there was a backwardness among the English about sending their children to schools, the voluntary system offered a far greater chance of removing it, for those who subscribed voluntarily naturally took an interest in the school and tried to induce the poor to send their children. In Prussia education was forced under the rigor of military punishment; but he was against a compulsory system in any sense, either by forcing parents to send their children to school under certain penalties or by depriving them of certain privileges if they refused to let them attend. A knowledge of the benefits that were to be derived from education ought to be the great incitement to seek it and every effort ought to be made to disseminate that leading principle. Although, in his mind, there was a very great risk in adopting a compulsory system, still it appeared to him that there was a much greater risk in doing nothing at all, and it was a gross mistake to suppose because that particular door was not open, that, therefore, no door was open by which provision could be made to remove the want of education. He approved the course recommended in 1818 and begun in 1833 of giving a sum of money to encourage those to proceed who were willing to advance the money for the formation of schools by voluntary subscriptions. This had been started on a small scale and the present year he had induced the House of Commons to make a further grant of the same amount. The effect had been that these sums by reason of their mode of application had called forth an equal sum of voluntary contributions. In one year there were new schools for 30,000 children.

In the system of education offered, however, there was a deficiency. The discussions which arose out of the education committees of 1816, 1817, and 1818 had occasioned new efforts for schools of a more useful type, having a larger pro-

portion of teachers and dispensing in a great measure with the monitorial system.[17] The difficulty lay in the lack of cheap seminaries for school masters. Brougham hoped that the attention of Parliament would be speedily called to this and that an additional £20,000 would be granted for the establishment of normal schools.

He also pointed out that the funds applicable to education, if bequests would be fairly managed, would be £1,500,000 annually and would be more than sufficient to supply all the expenses of a national system. He thought not everyone who had founded a school or hospital ought to be called charitable. There were no greater nuisances than some of the institutions called charities and if those at the head of some of them did not mend their ways he would call on Parliament to look on those establishments as placed peculiarly under their care and to see that those estates were more carefully executed.

But taken as a whole the best course to be pursued, instead of introducing any bill, was to try a little more experience on the subject. "Crude, rank, precipitate reforms," he said, "are worse and worse for the cause of reform than standing rock still."[18]

B. Taxes on Knowledge.

At this time Brougham was taking part in the agitation of a subject which had an indirect bearing on the extension of education, namely, the repeal of what were popularly called "Taxes on Knowledge". These dated back, as has been stated before, to the tenth year of the reign of Queen Anne and consisted of an excise tax on paper; a stamp duty on newspapers, pamphlets and books; and a tax on advertisements.[19] Since 1803 the tax on paper had been 3d. per pound.[20] By an Act

[17] Ibid., 3 S., CXXXV, c. 550.
[18] Liverpool Speeches, p. 12.
[19] Statutes at Large, 10 Anne, cap. 19.
[20] Ibid., 43 Geo. III, c. 69.

of 1815 [21] the stamp duty on newspapers had been made 4d. for every sheet or smaller piece whereof they consisted; on all pamphlets and numbers of books published in parts, exceeding one whole sheet, 3s. for each sheet; on almanacs, 1s. 3d.; and on advertisements, 3s. 6d.

The years of disturbance after the war had witnessed the publication of low priced pamphlets of less than a sheet (thus avoiding the tax), which contained observations on public events and which the Tories felt were exciting hatred and contempt for the Government and the constitution. In order to restrain these, one of the Six Acts of 1819[22] extended the newspaper stamp tax to all small pamphlets containing remarks on any matter in Church or State, published at intervals not exceeding twenty six days, and sold at less than 6d.; and no quantity less than 21x17 inches was to be a sheet. [23]

From the time this act was passed Francis Place had fought against the taxes, but as long as the Tories were in power there was little hope of their repeal. With the advent of the Whig ministry the question was pressed more vigorously. Place wrote articles on the subject for any paper that would publish them. In the House of Commons Mr. Bulwer repeatedly made motions for the repeal; and many petitions were presented from all parts of the country. Each time the question was brought forward the Chancellor of the Exchequer declared himself in favor of the principle of the repeal but feared its effect upon the revenue. [24]

In June 1834, Brougham was called before a committee of the House of Commons to give evidence on the Libel Law and declared himself in favor of the total repeal of the tax on

[21] Ibid., 55 Geo. III, c. 185.
[22] Ibid., 60 Geo. III, c. 9.
[23] At this time Brougham entered protest against the act, his objection being chiefly directed to the principle of resorting to stamp duties not as a means of revenue but as a means of prohibiting publication. Hansard, XLI, c. 1300.
[24] Wallas, Life of Francis Place, p. 336-7.

newspapers.[25] He considered this tax to have brought about two evil effects. In the first place, it was the cause of the worst libelous publications, both public and private. Security against abuse lay in the character of those who managed the newspapers. But laws made to restrain the press had a tendency to lessen this security, for whatever made the trade of a newspaper precarious tended to lessen the respect of those who resorted to contraband dealing. The worst libels appeared in the unstamped newspapers, which were sold in great numbers in violation of the law. While the fair dealer had to charge 6d. on account of the tax, the unfair sold his paper at 2d. The evil of libel could, therefore, be met by removing the impediment to the fair dealer; the smuggler could be destroyed by removing the duties.

The other bad effect of the tax was its obstruction to the progress of political knowledge and the diffusion of general information. As the publisher sold his paper to the newsman for 2d. and the tax was 4d., the necessity of political life and political intelligence was taxed 200%. To the poor man this price was a prohibitive one. It was the duty of a government to make all its acts generally and speedily known to the public; it was an injustice to punish men for what they could not know to be crimes. What channels were so easy as the public prints? But the Government said that the newspapers were only to be read by persons in easy circumstances. It was the duty of all free subjects to consider matters of a public nature, the acts of the Government, the conduct of the public servants, the occurrences of the time, and form their opinions upon them, but the price of papers deprived them of this intelligence.

Moreover, Brougham said those who had wished to provide for the people cheap, innocent and useful publications found that to a certain point they could go, but beyond that it was

[25] Political Economy Pamphlets, Vol. 205.

impossible for them to move. Where men were gregarious cheap publications sold readily but the peasantry he had nearly given over in despair. Books, however cheap, were repulsive to ignorant men but the newspaper, which furnished the best vehicle for useful information, would find its way into the farm house. "But it was prevented in many cases from entering, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer kept his hand on the latch."

This evidence Place reprinted in pamphlet form and had 10,000 copies circulated. He said in a letter to Hume:

"Scarcely any man in Parliament besides Lord Brougham appears to know the actual value of the repeal. In a moral point of view it is what Archimedes wanted to have in a physical point of view, a place to stand upon, a fulcrum to move the world." [26]

The next year in presenting a petition signed by many inhabitants of London Brougham took occasion to reiterate his opinions in the House of Lords. [27] He presided at one of the three big public meetings on the subject in the metropolis[28] and gave his active support to the movement until legislation resulted. In 1836, the stamp duty was reduced to 1d. [29]

C. Resolutions of 1835.

Meanwhile changes in the political arena were taking place which were to interfere with the full efficacy of Brougham's powers. Although Grey had retired in June, 1834, Brougham had retained the chancellorship in the first Melbourne min-

[26] Wallas, Life of Francis Place, fn. p. 337, Letter to Hume, May 2, 1835.

[27] Hansard, 3 S., XXVII, c. 85.

[28] Companion to the Newspaper, 3: 452.

[29] Statutes at Large, 6 & 7 Wm. IV, cap. 76.

The stamp duty was repealed in 1855 (18 & 19 Vict., cap. 27). The tax on advertisements was reduced in 1833 to 1 s. 6 d. (3 & 4 Wm. IV cap. 23), and was repealed in 1853 (16 & 17 Vict., cap. 63); that on pamphlets was repealed in 1833 (3 & 4 Wm. IV, cap. 231); that on almanacs was repealed in 1834 (3 & 4 Wm. IV, cap. 57).

istry from July to November. He was one of the most active Whigs in helping to overthrow the Peel ministry which followed, but when in April, 1835 Melbourne was called upon to form a new cabinet, and almost all the old ministers were recalled, Brougham was ignored by his colleagues. This to him was a sore disappointment. For a time the seal was put in commission, perhaps to ease his feelings, but when Lord Cottenham was appointed early in 1836 all hopes were gone.[30] To one who was vain and who from early youth aspired to personal prestige, such an omission was a great slight. From that time his influence on political party and political movement was ended. Sir Robert Peel said that Brougham was the most powerful man he had ever known in the House of Commons; but that no one had ever fallen so fast and so far.[31]

In May, 1835 Brougham, in announcing that he was going to submit certain resolutions on the subject of education to the House of Lords, was apprehensive that some might think more of the advocate than of the question, more of his politics than of its merits. Unless he could convince their Lordships, he said, that the subject was worthy of their attention he might be doing mischief to the cause, the progress of which it had been the great object of his life to advance. He realized that whoever undertook to bring forward a subject like education had a difficult task.

"He makes himself the advocate of measures which ought to be kept free from all admixture of party feeling—apart from all the disturbing forces of animosity—measures in which all parties have the same stake, so none ought to interfere with any other view, but to consider their merits upon the most enlarged principles, and with the most inflexible resolution to consult only the true interests of the country."[32]

[30] Dictionary of National Biography, article on Lord Brougham.
[31] Life of Gladstone by John Morley, Vol. I, p. 133.
[32] Hansard, 3 S., XXVII, c. 1293.

Mindful of the religious animosity which had been aroused by the bill of 1820, Brougham was reluctant to proceed by a general bill. Statistics had shown that the voluntary system had vindicated itself and until the efforts of individuals should be found insufficient and the institutions which they had established should be found going into decay no general interference of Parliament was necessary. And so he preferred to proceed by fourteen resolutions [33] which provided that the parliamentary grants should go to improve the instruction given and the state of the schools; and in presenting them he gave a detailed explanation. In the first place schools were too few. One ninth of the population were children between seven and twelve, but only one twelfth were educated and these were unequally distributed in all ranks. Nearly one half of the children of the poor were still destitute of all means of instruction. The remedy suggested was a continuation of the plan of giving money for the school house in proportion to private subscription. The master's salary should not be provided for because the poor should be encouraged to spare something for quarter-pence.

Next, education was confined to children of an age too advanced. He considered the establishment of infant schools one of the most important improvements in the civil polity of the country. The school which he had helped to establish in Westminster was still flourishing, although it was eclipsed by others to which it gave rise, especially Wilderspin's in Spitalfields and Wilson's at Walthanston. He and his friends had been called visionaries, speculatists, enthusiasts, theorists.

"We walked but walked onward, among clouds of such phrases, thickly buzzing about from every corner; a little noisy, less troublesome, but offering no kind of resistance to our progress. If my opponents smiled at me, I smiled at them,

[33] Ibid., 3 S., XXVII, c. 1331-33.

so that quarrel we had none; and at length they who laughed, were first silenced, then convinced, and are now active coadjutors. And now I am again exposing myself to a repetition of the ridicule, when I state that I consider that the establishment of Infant Schools in large towns, where crime is rife, where the people are closely crowded and ignorant, and vicious as well as ignorant—that planting those schools in such haunts of men as London, Westminster, Southwark, Manchester, Birmingham and Sheffield, would be the most simple and most efficacious preventive of crimes."

Punishment was useless as a deterrent; prevention was effectual. Infant schools were better than Newgate schools.

The real difficulty of providing the schools would be inconsiderable, "for all those persons who have themselves been thrown into evil communication by the want of knowledge and by early bad habits have invariably, to their praise be it spoken, looked favourably upon infant tuition". A calculation as to the cost he had through accident. A legacy of between £7000 and £8000 had been left him on supposition that he held certain opinions which he did not entertain, so he had decided to give it to infant schools. Finding he had to undergo a Chancery suit to get it he renounced it; but inquiries had been set on foot, in consequence of his conceived project, and for £,000 he found he could establish schools which would train that portion of a population of 130,000 which he supposed to furnish the criminals. If Parliament would give £30,000 for two years "we should be able to provide for the training of the whole of London on both sides of the river". One sixtieth of the population needed such schools and the supply was for only one one hundred and sixtieth.[34]

Next he dealt with the kind of education given in the schools.[35] It was exceedingly scanty and imperfect. "You could hardly say more in its praise than that it is better than

[34] Ibid., 3 S., c. 1293.
[35] Ibid., 3 S., XXVII, c. 1319.

nothing." England was far behind other countries. He had visited France the year before and found that normal schools were everywhere being established by the Government on the model originated by Fellenberg. In England only two such institutions existed, one having been established by each of the two big societies. He had frequently visited the school of the British and Foreign Society at the Borough Road.

"These seminaries for training masters are an invaluable gift to mankind and lead to the indefinite improvement of education. It is this which above everything else we ought to labour to introduce into our system;. . . . . no possible harm can result from the interposition of the Legislature in this department."

He estimated that £20,000 for five or six years with the individual efforts which would be called forth would be sufficient. If charitable foundations were properly utilized there would be an ample amount of funds applicable.

He proposed that a board be formed—

"To superintend the due and just application of the funds from time to time voted by Parliament for the promotion of Education, to establish proper Seminaries for training teachers, to encourage the trustees of Charities connected with Education in using beneficially the powers now possessed by them, to watch over the abuses of trust committed by such trustees, and to control the exercise of such new powers as Parliament may grant them". [36]

It was objected that he had neglected religious instruction in the resolutions, to which he replied that he was not unaware of the difficulties which surrounded this question; but he thought he would at a future time be enabled to lay such a plan before their Lordships.

[36] Ibid., 3 S., XXVII, c. 1332.

The debate on the resolutions was postponed until June 30. Then Melbourne objected to proceeding in that form with a principle of such great importance and suggested a bill instead.[37] He also stated that money had already been voted for a model school and that the Treasury was considering its establishment. Of this Brougham had not known; but he now objected to the smallness of the sum of £10,000 for that purpose. He also urged, since the Corporation Act was soon to be passed, that when they were turning over a new leaf, when they were making a new distribution of trust power, when they were taking the management of property out of the hands of one body and giving it to another, now was the time to see whether they could not establish an effectual barrier to the abuse of trusts.

The resolutions were finally withdrawn. Brougham had accomplished his view; they had been printed and discussed, and the subject was no longer new to anyone. Four days later he presented a bill, but it did not reach a second reading before the end of the session.

D. Education Bills of 1837 and 1838.

The wrong which Brougham believed he had sustained at the hands of the Whigs was something not easily forgotten. Depression could not be fought away and the year 1836 witnessed no speech from him in Parliament. But he was back in London in January, 1837, ready to take up matters where he had left them. He had divided his bill for education into two parts.[38] The first created a new department in the State, the Department of Public Instruction. Three paid commissioners, holding their places for life and removable only by address by both Houses of Parliament, with three ministers of the Crown and the speaker of the House of Commons were to form the board. The department it was proposed to in-

[37] Ibid., 3 S., XXVIII, c. 71.
[38] Ibid., 3 S., XXXVIII, c. 1618.

vest with such powers as would enable it to extend education throughout the country, to plant schools, to bestow properly those funds which might be afforded from time to time by Parliament and to superintend the distribution of such other funds as might be raised by local taxation for this purpose. The second branch of the bill related to the jurisdiction which was to be confided to the same board over the charity funds already in existence.

The bill was presented and read the first time on the first night of the session and an abstract of the provisions was made so that no one would have the excuse of not reading the bill. Objection was made, however, that it was too early in the session so the second reading was postponed. The bill was unfortunate at all times, for even in the middle of the session when there was literally nothing to do, it could not be proceeded with. Then at the end of the session the accession of a new sovereign made business like that of education out of the question. Since it was impossible that the bill should receive due consideration in the House of Commons, Brougham decided that nothing would be gained by urging it. He expressed satisfaction that it had been printed and that the more his plan was considered the more acceptance it had found.[39]

The scheme proposed had drawn the attention of the people outside Parliament. A petition, signed by 11,000 to 12,000 persons of Sheffield, was drawn up at a meeting presided over by the "Master Cutler" asking for the adoption of such a system of education as would elevate the moral character of the people. Another, presented by the Bishop of London, and signed by 5048 persons of the town of Cheltenham, stated that it was viewed with alarm that an attempt was being made to form a system of education which would be compulsory and which was to be of a totally secular character.[40]

[39] Ibid., 3 S., XXXIX, c. 432.
[40] Ibid., 3 S., XXXIX, c. 208-11.

The matter of religion had been carefully avoided by Brougham. Mindful of his former experience in 1820, he was of the opinion that there ought to be the most careful rejection and exclusion of any principle that was calculated to give either to the Established Church or to any one sect any preference, dominance, or authority, exclusively paramount, over the education of the people of the kingdom.

On December 1, 1837 he gave notice that he would soon present two separate bills, one on education generally and one on charities, based on the principles he had been advocating for three years.[41] He had divided the subject for there were many persons against a legislative measure relating to the administration of charities who experienced no difficulty with respect to duties of an education board. He was not going to wait until the first reading of the bills to explain their nature, for if he waited until they were printed it would be difficult to remove objections that might be formed in the Lords' minds.

These bills were founded on two general principles. First, he thought that there ought to be, in no time, in no country, whatever might be the constitution of the country and the state of society, any positive and direct compulsion as to the education of the people.

"It was a perilous matter to usurp the parental office by public authority and prescribe by a command of the State, fortified perhaps by the penalties attached to a civil offence, the line of parental management which the father and mother should pursue in taking care of the offspring which Providence and nature had committed to their care."

Also he thought that the compulsory principle was a violation of individual liberty—

[41] Ibid., 3 S., XXXIX, c. 432.

"That it was a tyranny, introduced no doubt, and he admitted it, for a laudable purpose, but nevertheless declaring, that in order to educate people they would enslave them, that in order to diffuse instruction amongst them they would contract their liberty and introduce a system which would be intolerable to the citizens of a free state".

The next general principle was that it should not be in the power of the Government to regulate the details of education, i. e. that its interference should be excluded beyond what was absolutely necessary. It appeared to him nothing more nor less than tyranny for any Government to have the power of deciding the number of schools to be established, the kind of instruction to be afforded in them, the mode of teaching to be adopted, and the description of books to be read. He would have no rules laid down either by law, or by boards, or by the joint operation of law and boards together; neither would he have the executive or the legislature to prescribe a course of instruction, and teach the people according to its own model. He held it to be a right that no Government should appoint instructors—that no Government ought to be intrusted with the power of naming those from whom the public at large were to receive the benefit of secular instruction. One should hold out incentive and encouragement and give facilities of every sort to enable the parent to discharge the duty. Accordingly, first of all, these inducements should consist in making education cheap, good, and easily acquired.

But no measure could be based merely on general principles. It must have particular reference to the state of education in England. Here there were obstacles to a uniform measure: 1. A vast number of schools were in existence. There were 50,000, of which 39,000 or 40,000 were unendowed and 10,000 endowed. Not all the children at the unendowed schools should be considered charity children. Twice as many paid as not. He agreed with those who said a system supported by mere charity was pregnant with evil.

No one had gone further than he in deprecating the extension of more than was absolutely necessary of that charitable system. 2. The Scotch system would not work in England. "Every system of education . . . . . must be so framed as to be capable of expansion and contraction, and easily susceptible of such variations and modifications as might suit the different parts of the country, and meet the views, the wants, and the altering state of the various towns and even villages which were found to exist in England." 3. There were many funds by endowment which were sufficient in one place and lacking in others. 4. The state of the country in respect to the religious feelings of the people was peculiar.

Brougham then stated that a public department to be called an Education Board was necessary. The present bill required that it be composed of two ministers of the Crown and three life members as against three ministers, the speaker of the House of Commons and three paid commissioners of the preceding bill. It was necessary to have some members of the Government for such matters as grants and the administration of grants required the concurrence of ministers who would be responsible. But the members were to have no power with respect to appointment of schoolmasters. They were to distribute the grants made from time to time by Parliament and the charity funds, according to the present law or future modifications. They were to name inspectors and have power to provide schools with the concurrence of the local authority.

This was the great principle of the bill, that the people among whom education was to be extended or improved should be a substantial check against the central authority. The members of the local body alone were to originate the plan of the rate. Unless they called for the rate or for the power of rating themselves there was no authority to impose any rate whatever upon them. On the other hand, the local body could not rate themselves without the authority of the

central board, so that the joint consent of the local and the central power served as a protection of the constituents against their representatives. If the local body made conditions unacceptable to the central they might subscribe according to the voluntary principle out of their own money but they could have no portion of a grant from Parliament. The principle of distribution adopted by the Treasury in 1833 was to be altered. The first grant had been equally divided between the two societies but as the principle of the Government was to make grants where one half of the sum was raised by local efforts, the British and Foreign Society had exhausted its funds the first year and the National Society, by reason of its superior local resources, soon absorbed two thirds and then three fourths of the grant.

The country was divided into (1) municipal corporations whose local affairs were committed to town councils and (2) those districts where people had no councils nor any body in whom the functions exercised in corporate towns were vested. If a parish or township not having municipal institutions chose, it could obtain for itself a body. Any given number of inhabitants, five or six for instance, could make requisition to the parish officer for a meeting at which a school committee should be appointed. The forming of the constituency who were to choose the school committee was a new proposition. The qualification was appropriately an educational one. Brougham had always entertained a strong and decided opinion in favor of this kind of indirect encouragement of education. All persons who were members for a certain time of a mechanics' institute, an association for education, or a literary society, and all persons educated at a university, Inns of Court, Inns of Chancery, public schools or any schools whatever, were to be enrolled. All those who were classified in any way were, if residents for twelve months, to enjoy the franchise. The school committee which this body would

elect was to be composed of rate payers and was to have power to levy the school rate.

Brougham felt that every plan of national education should embrace religious instruction. The authorized version of the Scriptures was to be read in all the schools founded, extended or improved under the bill, but the children of Jews and Roman Catholics were not required to be present during the reading unless the parents desired it. The same exemption was also to be made when the catechism and Thirty Nine Articles were expounded.

Brougham was convinced that he had at last worked out a plan which reconciled many inconsistencies and established forms which amounted on the whole to one great universal system of education, as far as any system could be applied to a country, the diversity of the local circumstances of which was as great and as various as in England. He wished throughout his measure strictly to adhere to the wise and benevolent maxim—"in essentialibus, unitas; in non-essentialibus, libertas; et in omnibus, caritas. . . . . ".[42]

The bill when presented had the support of Lord Melbourne's Government[43] but Brougham soon found he had to meet not the hostility of Dissenters this time but the prejudices of the Established Church. He had a vast amount of correspondence on the subject and met many deputations, some of them consisting of fifty or sixty individuals, of all sects and belonging to various classes of the community.[44] From the opinions expressed he found there was a general agreement as to the great principle of the measure but considerable disagreement as to religious instruction.

In the House of Lords the Archbishop of Canterbury was an opponent.[45] The Church of England (ecclesiastical and lay)

[42] Ibid., 3 S., XLIV, c. 1174.
[43] Ibid., 3 S., CXXXIII, c. 1.
[44] Ibid., 3 S., XLIV, c. 1174.
[45] Ibid., 3 S., CXXXIII, c. 1.

contended it could not unite in any plan of education not immediately under the superintendence of the parochial ministers, which did not make the catechism of the Church of England a necessary part of the instruction and of which the schoolmaster was not himself a Churchman. With the support of the Government Brougham had hoped to win, but on August 14, 1838, one of the prelates moved that the bill be read a second time on "that day three months" and consequently it was defeated. Brougham then realized that it was impossible to carry a measure on the subject of education without its being, in the first place, thoroughly considered throughout the country. Convinced that it was absolutely and utterly impossible to have any plan accepted without a compromise, he addressed a letter to his friend, the Duke of Bedford, [46] in concert with whom he had brought forward the bill, and he agreed that any proposition for a system of education would have to unite in its support the Church and the Dissenters.

E. Committee of the Privy Council on Education.

From the attitude of the House of Lords it was now evident that no popular education measure had any chance of passing into law. But a bill was not a *sine qua non*. What could not be done with the aid of the upper house was carried out by a method for which its consent was not needed. Members of the Government, including Lord John Russell, had not been willing to take the subject out of Brougham's hands. [47] Then, too, the religious difficulty had been a great obstacle. It had been aggravated by the fact that the Sovereign had subscribed £100 annually to the British and Foreign Society and the Duke of Kent was a patron. [48] For these reasons the Government had been unable either to adopt a general plan of

[46] Cf. Edin. Rev., 70: 154.
[47] Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, Vol. I, p. 93.
[48] Hansard, 3 S., XLV, c. 273.

education for founding schools to which Dissenters might subscribe, or to give its adhesion to the system lately propounded by the Church that the Church alone should conduct the education of the country.

The method of distributing the annual parliamentary grant of £20,000 by the Lords of the Treasury had proved very defective. For six years the money had been distributed through the societies and it was practically wasted. Inasmuch as one half of the sum had to be raised by local efforts, no provision was made for poor localities where it was most required. The officials of the Treasury had no real qualification for their work. No care was taken to insist on good school buildings or on the employment of efficient teachers and no inspection of schools was enforced. [49]

The unsatisfactory results caused the Chancellor of the Exchequer on July 5, 1838 to submit to the Treasury Board the expediency of procuring more detailed information than before concerning schools which had received building grants. He also recommended that a model school be erected. [50]

But the Government, influenced by Brougham's suggestions, thought it best that persons be appointed to whom the general management of the plan could be intrusted. In November, 1838 Lord Russell had made up his mind to deal with this subject and had drawn up a scheme which was discussed in the cabinet on November 26. [51] He thought that if the board appointed were composed of persons of different persuasions it would not possess the confidence of the Church. It was better, therefore, that the Government should form the body—call it a board or a committee, or what they would—not from any one religious body or sect, or from members of various sects, but from the official servants of the Crown, who

[49] Edin. Rev., 70: 154.
[50] Hansard, 3 S., XLVIII, c. 1313.
[51] Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, Vol. I, p. 94.

would always have to depend upon the confidence of the House of Commons and who would have to look to them to decide whether or not the system which they recommended was such as should be supported. He proposed that the President of the Privy Council and other Privy Councillors, being not more than five persons, should form a board, who should consider in what manner the grants should be distributed.[52] He wrote to the Marquis of Lansdowne, President of the Privy Council, who agreed, with the other official persons named, that if the House of Commons should make a grant for that purpose, he would conduct the measures necessary to carry the objects proposed by the Government into effect.

At the beginning of the session, on February 12,[53] Russell explained his scheme in the House of Commons: a grant of £30,000; a Committee of the Privy Council to superintend its administration; inspection of the schools; and a normal school for the joint education of the young of the Established Church and of the various sects. In this model school the Scriptures were to be read and Roman Catholics could use the Douay version. On April 10 the Queen by an Order in Council appointed the Committee of the Privy Council to administer the money that would be voted by the Commons.[54]

On April 30 Russell said with respect to the disposition of new sums of money that a vote would be required from Parliament before the Committee would feel themselves at liberty to proceed with any further arrangement than the two societies.[55] Accordingly, the Government drew up a separate estimate for the purposes of education so that the attention of the House could be invited to the merits of the scheme.

But the plan met with abuse. Melbourne threw cold water on it. Lord Stanley in a long speech tried to overthrow the

[52] Hansard, 3 S., XLV, c. 273.
[53] Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, Vol. I, p. 86.
[54] Hansard, 3 S., XLVIII, c. 1313.
[55] Ibid., 3 S., XLVII, c. 681.

whole project, relying upon the Church as the only teacher of knowledge, religious and secular. The Church claimed the exclusive function of superintending the Christian doctrines and lessons taught in schools; of selecting the books; of visiting the classes frequently; of examining the children, especially in their catechism, and religious progress, and of counseling and aiding the masters.[56]

The part most objected to was the permission to Roman Catholics to use their version of the Scriptures in the model school.[57] Petitions in opposition poured into Parliament.[58] Points were misunderstood so completely that Russell concluded that it was inadvisable to pursue the plan for the model school at that time and it was postponed.[59]

In the report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by Order in Council on June 3, it was recommended that the £10,000 granted by Parliament in 1835 for normal and model schools be given equally to the two big societies, instead of creating a normal school under the direction of the State. The remainder of the grants of 1837 and 1838 and the grant of 1839 were to be applied chiefly in aid of subscriptions for building and in particular cases for support of schools connected with the societies. The rule hitherto adopted of making a grant to those places where the largest proportion was subscribed was not to be invariably adhered to in case application be made from very poor and populous districts. Also grants were to be made in particular cases where application was not made through the societies. The power of inspection was to be introduced and a permanent staff of inspectors to be appointed.[60]

On the basis of the report the grant of £30,000 was car-

[56] Ibid., 3 S., XLIX, c. 324.
[57] Edin. Rev., 70:154.
[58] Journal of H. of C., 1839.
[59] Hansard, 3 S., XLVII, c. 1378.
[60] Ibid., 3 S., XLVIII, c. 1273.

ried on June 21, but only by a majority of two.[61] In the House of Lords the Archbishop of Canterbury had with a majority of the Lords succeeded in having a set of resolutions passed which were the subject of an address to the Queen, praying her to revoke the Order in Council.[62] The basis of the objection was a constitutional one. Parliament was not to be consulted with respect to the expenditure of the public money to be voted for this purpose and instead of the passage of any general act through both Houses the plan was to be effected by some bye procedure. It was said that this was too important a measure to be passed in that way. Finally, the Bishop of London suggested a compromise and Russell agreed to meet with the Marquis of Lansdowne, the Archbishop and two bishops. From this conference a treaty resulted.

F. Bill of 1839.

Toward the progress of the educational plan of the Government Brougham's attitude was first one of generosity, then of impatience and finally intolerance. On February 14, two days after Russell's explanation of the scheme in the House of Commons, in asking for some returns made by Russell in that House, he said—[63]

"He could not but take that opportunity to express his extreme satisfaction, and he meant it most heartily, his extreme satisfaction at the course taken by the Government in directing attention forthwith to the great and important subject of national education. This gave him the greatest satisfaction, and he should be most willing to enter into the consideration of the plan, that they should think proper to introduce, with all the disposition possible to support that plan. This was a subject to which he had paid very great attention for the last

[61] Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, Vol. I, p. 86.
[62] Hansard, 3 S., XLIX, c. 308.
[63] Ibid., 3 S., XLV, c. 350.

twenty years of his life, ... and it was, therefore, natural, that he should feel great happiness in seeing the subject taken up by the Government. Provided the object he had in view were attained, he did not care by what channel, or through what discourtesy it was attained. He should give as hearty and as effective a support as he could to the measure, if he could approve of it upon examination, as if it were his own. His noble Friends in the progress of the measure through that House should have all the benefits of his experience and the assistance of his zeal and he thanked them heartily for having taken the subject into their consideration."

On June 10, Brougham announced that he would no longer refrain from pressing forward his bill.[64] Nothing could be more absurd than the stories going forth, that the ministry was for a great system of national education. His bill applied itself to every part of that important question. As far as the constitutional question was concerned Brougham felt that the address to the Queen had been fully justified for it was too important a measure to be dealt with by Order in Council.

But the real accomplishment he felt had been small cause for alarm. All of the prelate's speech was merely on account of a minister's recognizing the doings of a certain function by five members of the Privy Council which heretofore had been done by one; namely, superintending the distribution of the annual parliamentary grant and establishing one normal school, this last having been abandoned.

"I complain of the system as not going far enough. I regret that the Government in deference to the senseless apprehensions of some—the miserable affectations of others—and the foolish prejudices of the rest—have pared down what ought to have been a general measure for the education of the people, into a mere plan for founding a single school in London and appointing a Committee of their own body to superintend the grant of £20,000 or £30,000. I am mortified

[64] Ibid., 3 S., XLVIII, c. 90.

that Parliament is not ready to do its duty to the people, that after twenty five years spent in deploring the want of public instruction in this country, after it has been by all parties confessed, that the people of England are less educated than those of Central Europe, and only better educated than the people of Spain or Italy; I am ashamed of our inglorious singularity in this respect, of our shameful exception to the character of the age in which we live, that after all that has been confessed . . . . . of the utter inadequacy of our present means of education, that all we have been able to 'screw our courage' to, has been the asking Parliament for a paltry £30,000, and appointing a committee of noblemen to distribute it. But it is still more mortifying to find, that there exist millions in this country who have been so far childish, thoughtless, and unreflecting, as to be led away by the cry, the clamour, the vulgar exploded outcry of danger to the Established Church! . . . . . Who ever thought of introducing any general system of education without consulting the wisdom of Parliament? The law stands thus—the Ministry can give away a million of money to any person they please, without ever asking your Lordships' consent. All they have to do is to have a vote of the other House."

He expected to live—"To see the Parliament of England perform, at length, its too long-delayed and most sacred duty, of giving instruction to all classes, of all descriptions, all ranks, and all sects of people, under the broad, universal and eternal principles of religious as well as civil liberty". [65]

He, therefore, proceeded on July 15 to move for the second reading of his bill. [66] This bill was in substance the same as the one of the preceding year. The recent contention about religion, he said, should be the occasion of much satisfaction. Thirty years before it would have been impossible to get such an assemblage of Lords as was present to vote on the address to the Crown. In this controversy raised by the

[65] Ibid., 3 S., XLVIII, c. 1313-24.
[66] Ibid., 3 S., XLIX, c. 308.

Church he was of the opinion that if secular and religious instruction would not combine secular alone should be given rather than have people in ignorance. He acknowledged the rights of the Church—he granted its endowment by law—but law did not say that the people of England should not be taught secular learning without the superintendence and control of the Church.[67] But after infinite discussion and mature deliberation he had realized that if a system of secular education only were adopted, teachers of religion must be employed, as well as those instructors who were originally engaged, and that would be too much for the poor to afford.

He, therefore, proposed that his measure should provide that it should not be lawful for the board to sanction the establishment of any school in which it was not part of the regulations that the authorized version of the Scriptures should be taught. Catholics and Jews could withdraw their children by signifying their wish in writing. In addition, he proposed that if any school, the local directors being members of any sect, should choose to lay down as part of its rules that the catechism, the liturgy and the Articles of the Church should be taught, the board should be allowed to sanction the establishment of that school, provisions being made in case of children not members of the Established Church analogous to those just alluded to.[68]

He had been one of the last to see the importance of combining religious and secular education; but now he was prepared to say, if he could not get secular instruction unless it were coupled with a kind of religious information which he disapproved, although he should lament that it was so, and he wished it were otherwise, and might have the greatest possible desire to see a different kind given—yet, so great was his alarm and so great was his fear of the bad consequences to

[67] Ibid., 3 S., XLVII, c. 764.
[68] Ibid., 3 S., XLIX, c. 308.

the morality and the peace of society likely to be produced by the continuance of the prevailing ignorance, that he should much rather have them taught a creed that he disapproved than not taught at all. He himself was as much opposed as any man to all sectarian and exclusive principles but there was nothing which he so much desired to see removed as ignorance.[69] He was prepared to support a comprehensive plan of education which gave some superintendence to the Church for the following reasons:—(1) There must be some superintendence and the Church was established. (2) It was the Church of the majority. (3) It was one and the sects were many and so it was possible and the other impracticable.[70] He considered the opinion of the country to have been fully pronounced in favor of religious education.

The bill met the fate of the preceding ones and was forced to be withdrawn on account of the lateness of the session. But Brougham pointed out the peculiar position in which the whole question then stood. If the Lords would conclude the session with a resolution to proceed next session by a bill they would perform their duty in a manner which would redound to the honor of Parliament, and to the credit of the Government. Nothing had more clearly shown the progress of the question than the debate on the subject this session. One inference he drew from this debate was that their Lordships would abdicate one of their greatest privileges if they were longer to neglect the establishment on sound, liberal, moral and religious grounds of a system of education for the people. It naturally struck him, too, that if he were to bring in his bill session after session, he was keeping exclusive possession of the subject; he was preventing others from taking it up who would come to the work with forces of a different kind to back them, and with more weight in the com-

[69] Ibid., 3 S., XLIX, c. 320.
[70] Ibid., 3 S., LXXXIX, c. 869.

munity and Parliament than he could pretend to have. He, therefore, thought that by withdrawing his bill he would do this great subject the best service in his power.

"Therefore it is that I have come to the resolution, not of abandoning this question—Heaven forbid! while I exist that is impossible, so woven is it with my heart, so entwined with my very nature, that I could not, any more than I durst if I could, forsake it; but I abandon it in a qualified sense of the term. I withdraw from it to leave others more powerful to take it up. I give it over to my noble Friend at the head of the Government. Let him apply his vigorous and manly understanding to the subject. Let him, with all the resources at his command, as head of the executive Government, let him, with all the assistance of the supporters of the Government in this House, take it up, according either to those principles, which have formed the ground-work of my bill, if it so please him, or according to any other or better principles, if he prefers them on reflection, and no man will be more ready to give up any share in promoting this great proceeding than I shall. Let him prepare a bill founded on right principles, and propounded in an enlightened and liberal spirit, it is needless to say with what cordial affection I shall greet his entering on such a course, and how my ancient attachment to him, which has never been altered, will revive in my bosom and will make me hail with joy his taking that part which his duty prescribes to him, but which his interest as a Minister ought to induce him to take, as the certain means, if not of carrying this great measure, of encircling his Government with a glory which will never fade." [n]

The fact that it was possible for others to take the helm in the education movement was a real tribute to the service of Brougham. What had been able to stand only with his support was now able to stand alone. The education question had become a popular one. The national conscience had been slowly stirring and the State was recognizing the principle that it should be responsible for the education of the people.

[n] Ibid., 3 S., L, c. 592.

It was an act almost of heroism for Brougham to yield his place as dictator, but, since political influence was gone, the cause was too dear to his heart for him to hinder its advancement through a stubborn personal claim of leadership. He was now to pass into the position of an independent and unattached critic of the measures and policies of other men.

G. The Social Science Association.

Much of Brougham's life was still to be passed where he said it should be, in his place in Parliament. Here he followed the progress of education with a keen interest; he was free with his comments and criticisms and often nagged to action.

During the last decade of his life his influence in the cause of education was exerted mainly through the activity of an organization of which he was the principal patron and guide. On July 29, 1857 the "Social Science Association" was formed, the committee holding its first formal meeting at his house in Grafton Street. He was chosen president for the year and delivered the inaugural address at the first congress at Birmingham. He held this office again from 1860 to 1865, then became president of the council for a year and finally was one of the vice-presidents until his death in 1868.[72]

The wide and indefinite scope of the departments of the association, including Jurisprudence, Education, Punishment and Reformation, Public Health, Social Economy, and Trade and International Law, pleased him greatly for they seemed to represent his own diverse interests.

In the second department the problem of middle class education was given most prominent attention.[73] What had been done on the part of the Government for elementary education had had no effect upon the middle classes. The common media of instruction for their children were boarding and day

[72] Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, 1858-1868.
[73] Ibid., 1864, p. 2-3.

schools opened on private speculation and proprietary schools belonging to a number of persons who united for the purpose of securing education for their children. But the benefits of the elementary system were soon seen to be of inestimable value. The number of schools planted, the providing of teachers qualified by training schools, inspectors appointed and salaried to secure the performance of duties, the qualifying of pupil-teachers and the defraying of the expense of employing them—all these advantages were not extended to the middle classes who paid a vast proportion of this charge.

In 1859 petitions with 40,000 signers had been presented in both Houses of Parliament praying that a greater efficiency in middle class school teachers might be obtained by a system of Government inspection with certificates of merit.[74] Brougham made the matter the subject of his addresses to the association and in Parliament. He pointed out that this class while not as numerous as the others was nevertheless a most important body.[75] He did not ask that the Government should compel private schools to submit to inspection or that Government regulations should be enforced upon them; but was anxious that some means should be adopted whereby the attention of the teachers in ordinary schools might be invited to the immense advantage which was derivable from an efficient system of inspection. If arrangements were to be made for permitting all who entered the profession to be trained and for granting certificates, which might have the effect of a diploma or a degree, the character of the teachers would be raised and the schools improved.[76]

The answer given by the Government to the petitions of which Brougham had presented one hundred and twenty was

[74] Hansard, 3 S., CLV, c. 252.

[75] The working classes amounted to between 15 and 16 millions; the upper classes to above 3 millions; and the middle to less than 1 million. Hansard, 3 S., CLXXV, c. 697.

[76] Hansard, 3 S., CLV, c. 252.

that the Privy Council had not the means of extending the system.[77] But Brougham continued to press the subject and in 1864 introduced a deputation sent by the council of the Social Science Association to the First Lord of the Treasury urging upon him the prayer of the petitioners, that the Government would apply its attention to the subject.[78] A discussion followed which showed that it was impossible for the education of the middle classes to be undertaken by the Government due to the large amount of patronage which it would place in their hands and on account of the expenditure of public money on those who could themselves afford to pay for the education of their children.[79] Brougham was of the opinion that a commission to inquire into the subject might render great service and the same year it was announced in Parliament that such a commission would forthwith be issued on the whole subject of middle class education.[80]

At the congress of the association in 1857 and 1858 Brougham's attention had been directed also to a more practical side of education. The expediency of requiring a capacity and willingness to instruct in other than the ordinary accomplishments of music and French and the three R's was evident, for he said:

"There is an absolute necessity for changing, in important respects, the method of educating female children, not only in the humbler but the better part of the working classes. They must be taught things which are of use to them in after life. . . A good system of rewards, the judicious application of prizes, the due encouragement to successful teachers of common things, and a steady determination in the patrons of such schools to enforce the most useful teaching in the first instance, allowing no substitute for it, may put an end to a

[77] Transactions of Nat. Ass. for Promotion of Social Science, 1860.
[78] Ibid., 1864, p. 2-3.
[79] Hansard, 3 S., CLXXVI, c. 1877.
[80] Transactions of Nat. Ass. for Promotion of Social Science, 1864, p. 2-3.

state of matters which has, in some places, produced the greatest difficulty of obtaining servants for families otherwise well provided, or wives for working men comfortably circumstanced." [81]

H. Conclusion.

It could truly be stated of Brougham that every branch of education had felt his touch. It was said at this time that he had "grown gray in talking of education". [82] That he had grown gray was true but that he had merely talked of education was a false accusation.

Twenty years before, Samuel Bamford, the Radical, had declared:

"Our educators are, after all, the best reformers, and are doing the best for their country, whether they intend so or not. In this respect, Lord Brougham is the greatest man we have. He led popular education from the dark and narrow crib where he found it, like a young colt, saddled and cruelly bitted by ignorance, for superstition to ride. He cut the straps from its sides and bridle from its jaws, and sent it forth strong, beautiful and free." [83]

Brougham had lived to see himself considered the patriarch of education. A second patent of peerage was granted him in 1860, with remainder to his younger brother William and his heirs male, an honor conferred in recognition of his eminent services in this cause and that of the suppression of slavery. In the same year he was made Chancellor of the University of Edinburgh. [84]

He did not see his great aim of a national system of education realized. While his specific plans were never accepted

[81] Ibid., 1860.
[82] Hansard, 3 S., CLV, c. 349.
[83] Bamford, Passages in the Life of a Radical and Early Days, Vol. II, p. 15.
[84] Dictionary of National Biography.

in toto when presented, so much practicability was there in his suggestions that they were steps in the slow evolution of a system. The most important improvements, initiated by him, passed into the hands and contributed to swell the reputation of men whom political partisanship or accidental circumstances had rendered for the time more powerful in Parliament.

His was the task of popularizing education. He espoused the cause when it was not easy to be a friend of the people and by so doing he gave the movement a powerful stimulus.

He was ready to form and pronounce judgments while others reached only the threshold of questions.[85] His service to education can best be summed up in the words of Gladstone:

"It seemed as if a certain instinct led Lord Brougham continually to deviate from the path of mere party politics for the purpose of anticipating the wants of coming generations and preparing the paths which after-coming men were to tread."[86]

[85] Fraser's, 44: 460.
[86] Hansard, 3 S., CXCIII, c. 1834.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Official Papers and Reports of Societies.

A. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.

The debates are under this title, 1803-1819; the New Series covers 1819-1830; the Third Series, 1830-1891.

Quotations in this thesis retain the form of indirect discourse.

B. Journals of the House of Commons.

C. Journals of the House of Lords.

D. Parliamentary Papers.

This is a set arbitrarily assembled, numbered and bound, with manuscript title pages by P. S. King of London. It is on file in the Library of the University of Pennsylvania.

Vol. 408: Four Reports of the Select Committee on the Education of the Lower Orders in the Metropolis, June 7, 13, 19 and 20, 1816.

Subjects: General state of the education of the lower orders; institutions and charitable donations for promoting education; misapplication of funds; system of general education; universities and great schools.

Report of the Select Committee on the Education of the Lower Orders in the Metropolis, July 7, 1817.

First Report of the Select Committee on the Education of the Lower Orders, March 17, 1818.

Recommends the introduction of a bill for appointing commissioners to inquire into the abuses of charities connected with the education of the poor in England and Wales.

Second Report of the same Committee, May 25, 1818.

Subjects: Parochial and other schools.

Third Report of the same Committee, June 3, 1818.

Subjects: British and Foreign School Society; Eton College; Schools of St. Bees, Winchester, Highgate, Pocklington, Brentwood, Mere, Spital, Yeovil, Huntingdon; education of the poor in Ireland; institution for the instruction of the poor at Hofwyl, near Berne, in Switzerland; Croydon and Wellingborough charities.

Fourth Report of the same Committee, June 5, 1818.

Subject: Statutes of Eton College.

Fifth Report of the same Committee, June 8, 1818.

Subjects: Statutes of Trinity and St. John's Colleges, Cambridge.

Vol. 366-399. Thirty-two Reports of the Commissions appointed to inquire into Charities for the Education of the Poor, March 2, 1819 to June 30, 1837.

These reports arise from the commissions issued under the authority of Acts 58 Geo. III c. 91; 59 Geo. III c. 81; 5 Geo. IV c. 58; 10 Geo. IV c. 57; 2 Wm. IV c. 34; 5 & 6 Wm. IV c. 71. They contain an examination into the state of the grammar and other schools for gratuitous education and into the appropriation of bequests for charitable purposes.

Vol. 711. Report of Commissioners (Newcastle Commission), appointed 1858, to inquire into the state of popular education in England and consider and report measures for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction of all classes of people, 1861.

Vol. 716. Report of Commissioners (Taunton Commission), appointed December 28, 1864, to inquire into education given in schools not com-

prised within the scope of the Commissions of June 30, 1858 and July 18, 1861 (Clarendon Commission on Public Schools), and also to consider and report what measures are required for the improvement of such education, having especial regard to all endowments applicable or which can rightly be made applicable thereto, 1868.

E. Statutes at Large.

F. Report of British and Foreign School Society, 1827, 1830, 1836-1837, 1841, 1843, 1844, 1845.

Report of 1836 contains copy of Treasury Minute of September 11, 1835; the appendix of the report of 1841 contains the regulations for government grants.

G. Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, 1839, 1841-1842, 1846, 1850-1851.

H. Recent Measures for the Promotion of Education in England. London, 1839.

Contains Treasury Minute of August 30, 1833; Lord John Russell's letter to President of Council, February, 1839; Minutes of Committee of Council, April 11, 1839 & June 3, 1839.

I. Report of National Society, 1840.

Appendix contains Report of Committee of Council, July 15, 1840.

J. Correspondence of the National Society with the Lords of the Treasury and with the Committee of Council on Education. Edited by Rev. John Sinclair. London, 1839.

Appendix contains Report of Committee of Council, June 3, 1839; and extracts from Minutes of April 13, 1839 & September 24, 1839.

II. Works of Lord Brougham.

A. Works of Henry, Lord Brougham and Vaux. Edited by A. & C. Black. 11 volumes. Edinburgh, 1872-3.

B. Lord Brougham's Acts & Bills from 1811 to the Present Time. Collected and arranged by John E. Eardley Wilmot. London, 1857.

C. Addresses at Meetings of Social Science Association. Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, 1858, 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864.

D. Installation Address at the University of Edinburgh, 1860. Living Age, 66:67.

E. Contributions to the Edinburgh Review. 2 volumes. London & Glasgow, 1856.

F. The Critical and Miscellaneous Writings of Henry, Lord Brougham, to which is prefixed a sketch of his character. Philadelphia, 1841.

G. Lord Brougham on Education. Edited by J. O. Taylor. New York, 1839.

H. Brougham and his early Friends—Letters to James Loch, 1798-1809. Collected and arranged by R. H. M. Buddle Atkinson and G. A. Jackson. 3 volumes. London, 1908.

I. The Life and Times of Henry, Lord Brougham, written by himself. 3 volumes. New York, 1871.

J. Lord Brougham's Opinions on Politics, Theology, Law, Science, Education, Literature, as exhibited by Parliamentary and Legal Speeches and Miscellaneous Writings. London, 1837.

K. Sketches of Public Characters—Discourses and Essays to which is added a dissertation on the Eloquence of the Ancients. 2 volumes. Philadelphia, 1839.

L. Brougham's Speeches upon Questions Relating to Public Rights, Duties, and Interests with historical introductions prepared by himself. 2 volumes. Philadelphia, 1841. 4 volumes. Edinburgh, 1838.

M. Selections from the Speeches and Writings of Henry, Lord Brougham and Vaux, with a brief memoir of his life. London, 1832.

N. A Full Report of the Speeches delivered by Lord Brougham and Vaux at Liverpool on Monday, July 20th, 1835. Liverpool, 1835.

O. Taxes on Knowledge, Stamps on Newspapers; extracts from the evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Libel Law, June, 1834. Political Economy Pamphlets, volume 205.

III. Memoirs and Correspondence.

A. Passages in the Life of a Radical and Early Days. By Samuel Bamford. 2 volumes. London, 1893. (Vol. II).

B. Recollections of a Long Life, 1786-1852. By Lord Broughton (John Cam Hobhouse). 6 volumes. London, 1910-1911. (Vol. V).

C. Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life. By George Jacob Holyoake. 2 volumes. London, 1892. (Vol.I).

D. The Life and Letters of Lady Sarah Lennox. Edited by Countess of Ilchester and Lord Stavordale. 2 volumes. London, 1902. (Vol.II).

E. The Life and Correspondence of Right Hon. Henry Addington, First Viscount Sidmouth. By Henry George Pellew. 3 volumes. London, 1847. (Vol. III).

F. The Life of Robert Owen written by himself. 2 volumes. London, 1857-1858. (Vol.I).

G. Memoirs of the Life of Sir Samuel Romilly written by himself; with a selection from his correspondence. Edited by his sons. 3 volumes. London, 1840. (Vol. III).

H. The Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1805-1840. Edited by Rollo Russell. 2 volumes. London, 1913.

I. Autobiography of a Working Man. By A. Somerville, London, 1854.

IV. Periodicals.

A. Annual Register, 1813-1840, 1856.

B. Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, Vol. 59.

C. British Almanac of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, 1838, 1842.

D. British Almanac and Companion of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, 1838, 1841.

E. British Quarterly Review, Vol. 26.

F. Chambers' Journal, Vol. 17.

G. Companion to the Almanac, or Year Book of General Information under the Superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, 1828-1831, 1834, 1835, 1837.

H. Companion to the Newspaper and Journal of Facts in Politics, Statistics and Public Economy, Vol. 1, 2, 3, 4.

I. Crisis. Vol. 1, 2, 3.

J. Edinburgh Review, Vol. 1, 9, 11, 17, 19, 21, 25, 28, 30, 32-36, 38, 41-43, 45-53, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 70, 81, 86, 107, 129, 135.

K. Fraser's Magazine, Vol. 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 18, 21, 31, 34, 44.

L. Living Age, Vol. 5, 6, 10, 14, 31, 47, 51, 54, 58, 66, 100, 110, 130.

M. London Magazine, Vol. 17.
N. Mechanics' Magazine, Vol. 1, 2, 3.
O. New Anti-Jacobin, Vol. 1.
P. Pamphleteer, Vol. 1, 27.
Q. Penny Magazine of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Vol. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6.
R. Quarterly Journal of Education, published under the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Vol. 1, 2, 3, 4, 10.
S. Quarterly Review, Vol. 19, 32, 38, 43, 44, 47-49, 53, 55-57, 76, 105, 126.
T. Tait's Edinburgh Magazine, new series, Vol. 2, 4, 5, 12, 15, 25.
U. Temple Bar, Vol, 23, 32, 34, 47, 62.
V. The Times, 1820.
W. Westminster Review, Vol. 15, 23, 41, 112.

V. Special Works on Miscellaneous Subjects.

A. History of the Elementary School Contest in England. By Francis Adams. London, 1882.
B. The Educational Systems of Great Britian and Ireland. By Graham Balfour. Oxford, 1898.
C. The Works of Jeremy Bentham, published under the superintendence of his executor, John Bowring. 11 volumes. Edinburgh, 1843. (Vol. V).
D. Century of Education. By Henry Bryan Binns. London, 1908.
E. Biographies:
1. Life of Lord Brougham, in Victorian Chancellors. By J. B. Atlay. London, 1906-1908.
2. Character of Lord Brougham in The English Constitution. By Walter Bagehot. New York, 1895.
3. Life of Lord Brougham, in Lives of Chancellors. By John Lord Campbell. London, 1869.

4. Dictionary of National Biography.
5. Life of Gladstone. By John Morley. 3 volumes. London, 1903. (Vol. I).
6. Lord John Russell. Edited by Stuart J. Reid. London, 1895.
7. Joseph Lancaster. By David Salmon. London, 1904.
8. Life of Francis Place. By Graham Wallas. London, 1898.

F. English Newspapers. By H. R. Fox Bourne. 2 volumes. London, 1887.

G. Essays on Education—Central Society of Education Publications, Vol. 1, 2, 3. London 1837, 1838, 1839.

H. The Manufacturing Population of England. By P. Gaskell. London, 1833.

I. National Education, Its Present State and Prospects. By Frederick Hill. 2 volumes. London, 1836.

J. Essay on Literary, Scientific and Mechanics' Institutions. By James Hole. Published under sanction of Society of Arts, London, 1853.

K. English National Education. By H. Holman. London, 1898.

L. State Intervention in English Education. By J. E. G. de Montmorency. Cambridge University Press, 1902.

M. London University. By James Bass Mullinger, in 11th edition of Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1910-1911.

N. England in 1835. By Frederick von Raumer; translated from German by Sarah Austin & H. E. Lloyd. Philadelphia, 1836.

O. Infant Schools their History and Theory. By David Salmon and Winifred Hinshaw. London, 1904.

P. Four Periods of Public Education as reviewed in 1832, 1839, 1846, 1862. By Sir James Kay Shuttleworth. London, 1862.

Q. Public Education as affected by the Minutes of the Committee of Council, from 1846 to 1852. By Sir James Kay Shuttleworth. London, 1853.

R. The Social Condition and Education of the People. By Sir James Kay Shuttleworth. London, 1850.

S. History of the Middle and Working Classes. By John Wade. London, 1835.

VI. Bibliographical Aids.

A. A Bibliographical List of Lord Brougham's Publications arranged in Chronological Order. By Ralph Thomas. London, 1873.

The list was compiled expressly for Messrs. A. & C. Black's edition of Lord Brougham's Works.

B. Bibliography of Education. By Will S. Monroe. International Education Series edited by Wm. T. Harris, Vol. 42. New York, 1897.

C. Catalogue of Parliamentary Reports and a Breviate of their Contents, 1696-1834. Ordered by House of Commons to be printed, August 15, 1834. London, 1836.

D. Digest of the Parliamentary Papers for the Session, 1837-1838. Compiled by John Henry Barrow. London, 1839.

INDEX

Adams, Dr., head-master of Edinburgh High School, 1.

Address to Queen, 1839, 105.

Adult education, 55; advocated in Brougham's "Practical Observations", 58; absence of Government assistance for, 59.

Bell, Dr. Andrew, schools of National Society based on ideas of, 12.

Birkbeck, Dr., Professor of Natural Philosophy at Andersonian University, 55; starts course of lectures for working men, 1800, 56; one of founders of Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, 66.

Book clubs, suggested as means of adult education, 61.

British Almanac, 69.

British and Foreign School Society, 5; formation of, 10; principles of, 10; terms of admission to, fn. 10; Brougham takes chair at meeting of, in 1835, 12; education grants to be distributed by, 83.

Brougham, Henry, early life of, in Edinburgh, 1; beginning of residence of, in London, 5; member of Royal Lancastrian Association, 9; entrance of, into Parliament, 10; resolution for formation of British and Foreign School Society moved by, 10; estrangement of, from British and Foreign School Society in 1820, 11; chairman of meeting of British and Foreign School Society in 1835, 12; estimate of Lancaster's work given by, 12; takes lead in cause of education, 13; given seat in Parliament for Winchelsea in 1815, 14; chairman of committee to inquire into education of the lower orders of the metropolis in 1816, 15; chairman of select committee on education in 1817, 19; chairman of education committee of 1818, 20; first report of committee of 1818 made by, 21; motion for charity commission made by, 23; bill for charitw commission presented by, 23; defends bill in committee of whole, 24; attitude of, toward amendments in House of Lords, 26; motion by, for addresses to Prince Regent, 27, 28; desires to be charity commissioner, not included in charity commission, 30; investigation of higher schools in 1818 by, 31; comments of, on Charitable Foundations Bill in 1819. 36; Peel's criticism of, 37; defense of, against Peel, 38; petitions of Robert Owen presented by, 50; admiration of, for Owen, 50; visits Owen's infant school, 52; opinion of the infant school given by, 52; visits Fellenberg's establishment at Hofwyl, 52; helped establish infant school at Brewer's Green, 53; patron of London Mechanics' Institute, 57; "Practical Observations on the Education of the People" by, 58; interest in mechanics' institutes, 65; plan of, for anonymous lectures, 65; formed committee for founding the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, 66; contributions of, to the society, 67, 70; effect of the patronage of, 70; suggests formation of London University, 73; application for charter made by, 76; returned to Parliament for York in 1830, 79; received great seal, 79; secured first education grant, 82; favored voluntary system, 84; opposed to compulsory education, 81, 96; favored establishment of normal schools, 86; favored repeal of "taxes on knowledge", 86, 89; gave evidence on Libel Law, 87; deprived of chancellorship, 90; presented 14 resolutions, 91; proposed a board of education, 93, 98; presented education bills in 1837 & 1838, 94; bills of, defeated by Church of England in 1838, 100; attitude of, toward Lord John Russell's plan, 105; presented bill in 1839, 106; attitude of, toward religious instruction, 107; withdrew from education question, 110; helped establish Social Science Association, 111; presented petitions to Parliament for middle class education, 112;

made Chancellor of University of Edinburgh, 114; Gladstone's estimate of, 114.
Buchanan, James, guardian of infant school at New Lanark, 51; master at infant school at Brewer's Green, 53.

Charity Commission, suggested, 17; bill for, in 1818, 20, 21, 23; opposition to bill for, outside of Parliament, 23; amendments to bill for, in House of Lords, 25; reappointed, fn. 39; Brougham chairman of, in 1836 & 1837, fn. 39.
Charity schools, endowed, 7; unendowed, 7; for working classes, 7.
Charitable Foundations Bill, 1819, introduced by Lord Castlereagh, 35; provisions of, 35.
Committee of the Privy Council on Education, 101; proposed by Lord John Russell, 102.
Committee on the Education of the Lower Orders of the Metropolis, 1816, 15; Brougham, chairman of, 15; circular letter sent by, 15; reports of, 17-18.
Companion to the Almanac, 69.

Dame schools, for working classes, 7, 8; inferior to infant schools, 53.
Department of Public Instruction, proposed by Brougham, 94, 98.

Edinburgh Review, first contributors to, 3; Brougham's contributions to, 3, 5; channel for publication of Brougham's views, 4; article of Brougham in, October, 1824, 58.
Edinburgh Society of Arts, 56.
Education, statistics in regard to, 6, 14, 41; means of, for wealthy persons, middle classes and working classes, 6.
Education Bill of 1820, 39; unfortunate moment for presentation of, 40; four heads of, 42; power given to Church of England in, 47; opposition to, 47; defeated, 49.
Education Bill of 1837 & of 1838, 94; of 1839, 105.
Education Digest, begun, 32; partially completed, 40.
Elementary education, 14; petitions for, in 1833, 80; in 1837, 95; investigation of state of, by Lord Kerry's Commission, 80; Mr. Roebuck's motion for, 81; first money grant for, 83; Brougham presents fourteen resolutions on, 91; Committee of Privy Council on Education for supervision of, 101.
Endowments, old education, bill for improvement of, 49; bill defeated, 49.
Established Church, control of, over education recommended in 1818, 34; powers given to, by bill of 1820, 47; opposition of, to bill of 1838, 100.

Factory schools, for working classes, 6; influence of Factory Act of 1802 on, 7.
Farmers' book clubs, 64.
Farmers' Series, in Library of Useful Knowledge, 69.

Glasgow Mechanics' Institution, 56.

Home and Colonial Infant School Society, 54.

Infant school, 50; established by Owen at New Lanark, 50; Fellenberg's, 52; at Brewer's Green, Westminster, 53; success of Brougham's, 54; assistance of Government for, not essential, 54; a preventive of crime, 92.

Journal of Education, 69.

King's College, principles of, 77; founded, 77.

Lancaster, Joseph, school of, at Borough Road, 5; Royal Lancastrian Association, formed to assist, 9; school of, at Tooting, 10.
Lectures, suggested as means of adult education, 61; not to be gratuitous, 62; plan for anonymous, 65.
Libraries, suggested as a means of adult education, 61; spread of, 63.

Library of Entertaining Knowledge, 68.

Library of Useful Knowledge, 67.

Loch, James, friend of Brougham, 2, 4.

London Mechanics' Institute, founded, 56; theater built for, 57.

London University, 73; suggested by Brougham in "Practical Observations", 73; plan for, 75; objects of, 75; charter of, applied for, 76; opening of, 77; action of, limited to institution of examinations and conferring of degrees, 78.

Mechanics' institute, the, relation of Dr. Birkbeck's work to, 55; of 1817 in London, 56; spread of, 63; curriculum of, 64; Brougham's interest in, 65; opposition to, 70-72; decline of, 72; of Manchester, Brougham's address to, 72.

Misapplication of charitable funds, reported to education committees, 17, 20, 21.

Monitorial system, controversy as to origin of, 12.

National Society, founded, 11; principles of, 11; terms of admission to, fn. 11; education grants to be distributed by, 83.

Owen, Robert, "New View of Society" by, 50; petitions of, to Parliament, 50; explanation of system of schools by, to education committee in 1816, 51; "New Institution" of, at New Lanark, 51; infant school of, 51.

Peel, Sir Robert, criticizes Brougham in Parliament, 37.

Penny Cyclopaedia, 70.

Penny Magazine, 70.

Place, Francis, observations of, on opportunities for education, 74; opposition of, to "taxes on knowledge", 87.

"Practical Observations on the Education of the People", 58.

Religious instruction, Brougham's attitude toward, in 1839, 108.

Romilly, Sir Samuel, bill of, in 1812, 22; helps to prepare bill for charity commission, 23.

Russell, Lord John, proposes Committee of Privy Council on Education, 102; scheme of education explained by, 103; postpones plan for model school, 104.

Schools of industry, for working classes, 6, 7.

Select Committee on Education, 1817, appointed, 19.

Select Committee on Education, 1818, appointed, 20; inquiry of, to embrace England, Scotland and Wales, 20; reports of, 21, 31; investigates higher schools, 31; plans of, for universal education, 32.

Social Science Association, 111; Brougham, president and chief patron of, 111; scope of departments of, 111; advocates improvement of middle class education, 111.

Societies for the promotion of conversation, suggested as means of adult education, 61.

Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, formation of, 66; publications of, 67-70; opposition to, 70.

Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, establishment of unendowed charity schools by, 7.

Special visitors, charities with, exempted from investigation, 26.

Sunday School movement, inaugurated by Robert Raikes, 7.

"Taxes on Knowledge", 86; opposition to, by Francis Place, 87; Brougham's evidence against, 87; reduced in 1836, 89.

Universities, restrictions of education at the, 74.

University College, London, 78.

Whitbread, education bill of, in 1807, 13, 39; subsiding of prejudices against, 40.

Wilderspin, teacher of infant school at Spitalfields, 54.

Young, May, guardian of infant school at New Lanark, 51.